DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 770 95 SP 009 460

AUTHOR Kemble, Eugenia; McKenna, Bernard H.
TITLE PBTE: Viewpoints of Two Teacher Organizations. PBTE Series No. 18.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 100p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Objectives; Educational Accountability; Evaluation; Governance; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Performance Criteria; *Teacher Associations; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents the viewpoints of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the National Education Association (NEA) on the subject of Performance Based Teacher Education (PBTE). These manuscripts, solicited from members of the staffs of these two major teacher organizations, describe the concerns that members of the profession have concerning PBTE. The first paper, by a representative from AFT, begins by focusing on the political origins of the competency movement. It then discusses abstract definitions and program realities of PBTE, as well as the kinds of considerations that must go into deciding whether or not the competency based movement will have an impact on improving the quality of teacher education. The second paper, by a representative fom NEA, begins by considering the negotiable interests of teachers in teacher education, and why teachers want and require a major role in the activities in teachr education. The paper goes on to stress the need for alternative models in teacher education. A discussion of specific issues in PBTE which are of concern to teachers, and the importance of the continuing education of teachers and other educators concludes this paper. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111770

PBTE: VIEWPOINTS OF TWO TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS

by

Eugenia Kemble
Staff Chairman, AFT Task Force on Educational Issues
American Federation of Teachers
New York, New York

and

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bernard H. McKenna
Professional Associate
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

for the AACTE
Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education
PBTE Series: No. 18.

September 1975

SP 009 460

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20036

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, through the Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education or the Texas Education Agency and no official endorsement by the United States Government should be inferred.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 75-24745

Standard Book Number: 910052-90-5

PBTE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Lorrin Kennamer, Chairman; Dean, College of Education, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712

Patricia Cabrera, Dean, College Development, East Los Angeles College, 5357 East Brooklyn Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90007

Patrick L. Daly, Vice President of AFT and Social Studies Teacher, Edsel Ford High School, 20601 Rotunda Drive, Dearborn, Michigan 48124

William Drummond, Professor of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601

L. Harlan Ford, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Personnel Development, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas 78701

Tommy Fulton, Past President of Oklahoma Education Association and Art Teacher, Jarman Jr. High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma 73110

David Krathwohl, Dean, College of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 78712

Margaret Lindsey, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, Box 135, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, New York 10027

Donald Medley, Chairman, Department of Research Methodology, School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Gilbert Shearron, Chairman, Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education, 427 Aderhold Building, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601

STAFF

Karl Massanari, Associate Director, AACTE; Director, PBTE Project

Shirley Bonneville, Program Associate, PBTE Project

Nancy Hoagland, Manager, PBTE Information Center

Jane Reno, Technical Editor

Sharon DeVeauuse, Secretary

Brenda Belton, Secretary

Mona Chase, Secretary

Foreword

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) is pleased to publish this paper as one of a series of monographs sponsored by its Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. The series is designed to expand the knowledge base about issues, problems, and prospects regarding performance-based teacher education as identified in the two papers on the state of the art developed by the Committee itself.[1],[2]

Whereas these two papers are declarations for which the Committee accepts full responsibility, publication of this monograph (and the others in the PBTE Series) does not imply Association or Committee endorsement of the views expressed. It is believed, however, that the experience and expertise of these individual authors, as reflected in their writings, are such that their ideas are fruitful additions to the continuing dialogue concerning performance-based teacher education.

Since the beginning of the PBTE Project, the Committee has recognized the critical importance of involving representatives of teacher organizations in its activities. The composition of the Committee itself reflects this concern. Because the implementation of PBTE programs includes the contribution of school-based teacher educators, school personnel will be involved in teacher education programs. Therefore, the viewpoints and concerns of teachers about the application of PBTE to preservice and inservice education programs need to be considered as such programs are designed and implemented. The authors of this monograph present the viewpoints of two teacher organizations. While it is not the purpose of this monograph to present the official positions of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association about PBTE, it does set forth the views of these two organizations as perceived by AFT and NEA staff members respectively. The Committee believes that these two papers make an important contribution to the literature about PBTE and that they will provide further stimulation to the dialogue about this approach to teacher education.

AACTE acknowledges with appreciation the role of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES) of the U.S. Office of Education in the PBTE Project. Its financial support (provided through the Texas Education Agency) as well as its professional stimulation, particularly that of Allen Schmieder, are major contributions to the Committee's work.

---

[1] Stanley Elam, Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art? (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971).

[2] AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1974).

The Association acknowledges also the contribution of members of the Committee who served as readers of this paper. Special recognition is due Lorrin Kennamer, Committee Chairman; David R. Krathwohl, member of the Committee and Chairman of its Publications Task Force; and to Shirley Bonneville and Jane Reno of the Project staff for their contributions to the development of this publication.

Edward C. Pomeroy
Executive Director, AACTE

Karl Massanari
Associate Director, AACTE
and Director, PBTE Project

Introductory Note

It would be unfortunate if readers were to conclude that a monograph's position in the series is an indication of the importance the Committee attached to any given topic. For instance, evaluation, a key concern in PBTE, was not covered in depth until the eleventh in this series. What, of course, most readers did not realize is that evaluation was among the *first* topics commissioned, but the project could not be brought to fruition and we had to start over. So it has been with this topic. From its very earliest discussions, our Committee has been concerned with the practicing teacher's view of performance-based teacher education. Representatives of both AFT and NEA on the Committee, Pat Daly and Tommy Fulton, respectively, have been most helpful in assisting us in carrying through this, the second, but only successful effort to put such a monograph together. We are most grateful to them.

These manuscripts, solicited from members of the staffs of the two major units representing teachers, describe the concerns that members of the profession have about PBTE. A major underlying consideration, of course, is its implications for initial certification and especially for the periodic recertification of teachers which might easily follow if performance-based initial certification were to be successfully carried out. This and other issues show in the manuscripts, and together provide an excellent overview of the problems. Most readers will find many of the statements speak for them regardless of their positions, not just for teachers.

Unlike previous manuscripts, which the Committee could publish or not, depending on the quality of the manuscript submitted and the author's willingness to accept suggestions, from the beginning we made a commitment to the authors to publish these manuscripts. While they have undergone the same scrutiny, including suggestions to authors, as previous manuscripts, authors were free to accept or reject all comments and suggestions. It should be noted, however, that they have been most responsive and appreciative of our comments.

Hopefully this monograph will lay further to rest some people's inappropriate perception of the Committee as one attempting to persuade everyone to adopt PBTE. Members of the Committee vary in their opinion of PBTE, but agree that PBTE has positive *potential* and is *one* of the possible teacher education program types that deserves development by those interested. The Committee has been fortunate in securing federal funding that is intended to carry PBTE to the highest potential that currently available techniques make possible. The attainment of that goal has been a major function of the Committee. But, unfortunately, as critics of PBTE often have noted, PBTE lends itself easily to programs based only on teaching the simplest mechanical behaviors and those dealing solely with cognitive behavior at that. A poorly developed, or only half developed, PBTE program could easily be worse than the program it replaces. Thus, most of our monographs have been intended to provide models for those interested in PBTE, helpful material on problems of developing performance-based programs, and recommendations that would allow PBTE type programs to attain their full potential.

At the same time, however, we have issued statements opposing the mandating of performance-based programs by state departments of education. In addition, we have published monographs critical of PBTE and pointing out its weaknesses. From earlier published statements of the major teacher associations, it was clear that this monograph would be largely critical of PBTE. Our continued commitment to publishing it is further evidence of our efforts to keep the dialogue balanced and the major issues evident for all to see.

David R. Krathwohl, Member of the
PBTE Committee and Chairman of its
Task Force on Publications

Contents

Page

Foreword iii

Introductory Note v

PBTE: Viewpoints of Two Teacher Organizations

Part One by Eugenia Kemble

- Introduction 3
- Section I - The Political Origins of the Competency Movement 7
- Section II - The Competency Doctrine Spelled Out -- Abstract Definitions and Program Realities 12
- Section III - Cautions and Other Options 24
- Conclusion 29
- Footnotes 31
- Bibliography 33

Part Two by Bernard H. McKenna

- Preface 36
- Introduction 37
- Section I - Negotiable Interests of Teachers in Teacher Education 39
- Section II - Teachers' General Professional Stake in Teacher Education: Why Teachers Want and Require Major Voice in the Activities Described in the First Section 49
- Section III - The Need for Alternative Models 54
- Section IV - Specific Issues in Performance-Based Teacher Education of Concern to Teachers 60

Section V - The Importance of the Continuing Education of Teachers and Other Educators 72

Some Summarizing Conclusions 76

Footnotes 78

Bibliography 82

About AACTE

About the Texas Teacher Center Project

The AACTE Board of Directors

AACTE Special Series on PBTE

Order Form for Recent AACTE Publications

PBTE: VIEWPOINTS OF TWO TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS

PART ONE

by

Eugenia Kemble
Staff Chairman, AFT Task Force on Educational Issues
American Federation of Teachers
New York, New York

Introduction

There has been much said and written over the past five years on the phenomenon known as performance- or competency-based education.* Yet, even as the debate over the merits and the drawbacks of this particular approach to teacher education continues, states are encouraging -- even mandating -- that it be adopted and many education schools are rushing to join the new movement by changing their form of teacher preparation to fit the new thinking. Initially, performance approaches to teacher education were embraced enthusiastically by almost everyone who had ever complained about the inadequacies of teacher preparation. Only teachers themselves, who have also complained about the inadequacy of their training -- perhaps the most loudly -- have sounded a cautious note. The cheering can still be heard and the movement continues to gain ground, but to date its advocates have very little in the way of educational improvement to show for their labors.

Despite the absence of proven success, at last count as many as thirty states had expressed some form of interest in implementing performance-based programs, including everything from supporting a few trial projects to mandating program revision.[1] Most teachers, on the other hand, have remained skeptical, even hostile, to the approach. Schools of education take differing views depending, in some cases, on whether they are leaders of the movement or foot-draggers who have been forced to make the changeover as a result of state mandate. The most vocal and energetic supporters continue to be those federal bureaucrats, professors, and researchers who have defined their careers through an advocacy role and those policymakers who like the ring of the competency jargon because it conveniently fits their political purposes.

While all this beating of breasts and innovation goes on, many of the basic questions remain unanswered:

> Why has this particular form of teacher preparation become so popular so quickly, *now*?
>
> What is it? Does it have any definable substance either in theory or practice?
>
> Will it improve the quality of teaching and, if not, what will?

Any discussion which attempts to answer these questions must deal with some concept of what a teacher is. Such a concept inevitably incorporates assumptions about human nature; assumptions about what is known and unknown in education; and assumptions about the degree to which social and educational theories must or should be bent to fit political and economic realities.

---

*The terms "performance" and "competency" will be used interchangeably in this paper.

The rise of the performance movement has caused the conception of the teacher to be defined broadly in two different ways. One way sees the ideal teacher as a person who must and does *know* enough about learning processes, child development, curriculum, and diagnostic techniques, to make intelligent choices in developing sound teaching strategies to fit the infinite variety of learning situations he or she must either react to or create. This notion of the teacher, which is rooted mainly in the humanism and pragmatism of philosophers like John Dewey, presumes a faith in the teacher's ability to make judgments, possess knowledge, and adapt to different situations. It places its main emphasis on teaching and learning as a *process* that involves continuous growth and adjustments. It assumes an optimistic faith in the potentialities and abilities of teachers as professionals. It acknowledges that the intelligent judgments of professionals must often be based on hunches which stem from the knowledge they do have about education and which recognize the limits of that knowledge.

The second broad view of what the teacher is makes an attempt to outline the ideal teacher in specific, more limited terms. It conceptualizes a good teacher in terms of models produced by those who assume knowledge of which skills or behaviors, i.e., performances or competencies, are effective. These models, or collections of idealized skills, are thought to be replicable to many learning situations. The teacher in this case simply molds his own behavior to fit the model and supposedly he becomes a professional. His own judgment is demeaned because, essentially, this type of training is designed to make him "teacher-proof" or, in other words, to protect him from what is assumed to be his own inherent inadequacy. If he goes by the model or a list of prescribed skills, this notion assumes, it may not matter much if he is ignorant, rigid, and lacks judgment because it is the external model or definition of competence which is really prescribing what the teacher does. In this view the ideal teacher is the *product* of model-building and he approaches the teaching of his students in the same way because his own success will be measured by the *product* of student achievement. The *process* of education as evolving teacher-learner interaction defers to the *product* of measurable achievement as a goal brought about by teachers who are themselves products.

Quite obviously this concept of the teacher takes a much more pessimistic view of his capabilities. It says, in essence, that he will do well only if he imitates somebody else's notion of what constitutes good teaching. It also assumes that educational research has advanced far enough to provide him with a model of teaching behavior worth imitating and to judge and dismiss all the other views of teaching that exist. It is this latter concept of teaching, which owes its philosophical origins to the behaviorist theories of B.F. Skinner, on which the competency movement largely rests.

Interdependence determines the limits of quantitative measurements for educational science. That which can be measured is the specific, and that which is specific is that which can be isolated. The prestige of measurements in physical science should not be permitted to blind us to a fundamental educational issue: How far is education a matter of forming specific skills and acquiring special bodies of information which are capable of isolated treatment? It is no answer to say that a human being is always occupied in acquiring a special skill or a special body of facts, if he is learning anything at all. This is true. But the *educational issue* is what *other* things in the ways of desires, tastes, aversions, abilities and disabilities he is learning along with his specific acquisitions.

The control of conditions demanded by laboratory work leads to a maximum of isolation of a few factors from other conditions. The scientific result is rigidly limited to what is established with these other conditions excluded. In educating individualities, no such exclusion can be had. The number of variables that enter in is enormous. The intelligence of the teacher is dependent upon the extent in which he takes into account the variables that are not obviously involved in his immediate special task. Judgement in such matters is of qualitative situations and must itself be qualitative.

The parent and educator deal with situations that never repeat one another. Exact quantitative determinations are far from meeting the demands of such situations, for they presuppose repetitions and exact uniformities. Exaggeration of their importance tends to cramp judgement, to substitute uniform rules for the free play of thought. . .

There is no such thing as a fixed and final set of objectives, even for the time being or temporarily. Each day of teaching ought to enable a teacher to revise and better in some respect the objectives aimed at in previous work. . .

The scientific content of education consists of whatever subject matter, selected from other fields, enables the educator, whether administrator or teacher, to see and to think more clearly and deeply about whatever he is doing. Its value is not to supply objectives to him, any more than it is to supply him with ready-made rules. Education is a mode of life, of action. As an act it is wider than science. The latter, however, renders those who engage in the act more intelligent, more thoughtful, more aware of what they are about, and thus rectify and enrich in the future what they have been doing in the past. Knowledge of the objectives which society actually strives for and the consequences actually attained may be had in some measure through a study of the social sciences. This knowledge may render educators more circumspect, more critical, as to what they are doing. It may inspire better insight into what is going on here and now in the home or school; it may enable teachers and parents to look further ahead and judge on the basis of consequences in a longer course of developments. But it must operate through their own ideas, plannings, observations, judgements. Otherwise it is not *educational* science at all, but merely so much sociological information. . .

The sources of educational science are any portions of ascertained knowledge that enter into the heart, head and hand of educators, and which, by entering in, render the performance of the educational function more enlightened, more humane, more truly educational than it was before. But there is no way to discover what is 'more truly educational' except by the continuation of the educational act itself. The discovery is never made; it is always making. It may conduce to immediate ease or momentary efficiency to seek an answer for questions outside of education, in some material which already has scientific prestige. But such a seeking is an abdication, a surrender. In the end, it only lessens the chances that education in actual operation will provide the materials for an improved science. It arrests growth; it prevents the thinking that is the final source of all progress. Education is by its nature an endless circle or spiral. It is an activity which *includes* science within itself. In its very process it sets more problems to be further studied, which then react into the educative process to change it still further, and thus demand more thought, more science, and so on, in everlasting sequence.

(From The Sources of a Science of Education,
by John Dewey, pp. 64-77.)

If these two concepts of the teacher form the parameters for debate over the value of different forms of teacher education the next question then becomes: why has either view gained the ascendency at any particular time? Why are educators so enamored of performance- or competency-based approaches today, particularly when only yesterday the philosophies of open education and informal schooling were having their second heyday? The answer lies partly in the vulnerability of education to the trend-setting of politically-motivated fads.

It is unfortunate that, since the beginning of the public school system, new ideas for the school have usually had more to do with politics and economics than with education. For example, in the early nineteenth century, it was the Lancastrian system's use of large numbers of students to teach rather than employing additional teachers that made public education cheap. In the 1910's and 1920's, the Gary Plan, based on an industrial platoon system and year-round schools, was designed to get maximum efficiency and productivity out of the "school plant." In the mid-1960's when everyone accepted the idea that schooling was good and spending money was politically popular, all kinds of new compensatory programs were funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Only a few years ago, when the mood shifted to skepticism, performance contracting became the tool of a new crop of budget-cutters. Today their pet project is accountability, which in many states hides behind the mask of competency-based teacher education and certification.

Part of the reason for this has to do with the tendency of any educational system to mirror the national mood, but part of it can also be attributed to the fact that we do not really know very much about education. Educational research suffers from all of the pitfalls and vagaries of any social science and this inherent weakness is compounded by the fact that the research community has been historically fragmented and isolated from the practical world of the schools. As a result, research and researchers tend to follow the faddish swings of popular programs in order to stay in business rather than to concentrate on discoveries of substance which might give educators something solid to build on. And, because educators have little solid to build on, what happens in the schools simply continues to follow political trends.

The current focus on teachers (and we shall discuss the contemporary reasons for this focus shortly) is given added legitimacy by the historical failures of teacher education, failures of which teachers are well aware. It has been well-documented (Broudy, Conant, Dreeben, Koerner, Smith) that, among professionals, teachers are subject to less rigorous preparation. Education schools tend to have lower entry requirements than liberal arts colleges and education departments within liberal arts colleges are generally thought to be "easier" than others. Frequently, teachers in training receive less in the way of a broad liberal arts background and often the liberal arts subjects they do take are concentrated in the social sciences. Most education schools do not have research arms and those that do rarely require that all prospective teachers receive research training. The length of the training period is short and usually the field experience requirements are both inadequately supervised and unsatisfactorily woven into the total preparation program.

Lack of integration and breadth characterize many aspects of the pre-service experience. Teachers may be plugged into courses which supposedly teach them how to teach reading, for example, and be given simple exposure to a few commercially developed programs or a limited range of techniques without ever confronting the whole scope of approaches known or the variety of educational philosophies which back them up. In the end, the result is lack of rigorous training.

If these are the overall characteristics of public education and teacher preparation which set the stage for dramas like the competency-based movement, there are many more specific ones that were ushered in with the Nixon era in 1968. If we can assume that our lack of knowledge about education makes politics the prime determinant of what goes on in the schools, the politics of the Nixon-Ford era should provide us with a good part of the reason for the popularity of competency-based education.

Section I

The Political Origins of the Competency Movement

Almost everything that has happened in education since the first Nixon administration came into office has something to do with two closely interconnected notions: 1) the idea that the public schools are failing and 2) a commitment to the belief that because the schools are failing they should be given less money. These two phenomena, when combined with the demographic shifts coming from declining student enrollment, have tended to focus on teachers much of the critical attention given to public education. To many educational decision makers, teachers are now thought of as "to blame" for low student achievement, as "too expensive," and as constituting a "surplus" of costly personnel. A thorough discussion of these factors will show how performance- or competency-based education has become one way for the federal and state governments to deal with all these prejudices.

To begin with, though the idea may be originating with a vocal and educated elite, there is a growing feeling that the schools are failing. Even though the Gallup Poll indicates year after year (according to the 1974 poll 64% of public school parents gave the schools an "A" or a "B" rating and only 3% thought them to be failing)[2] that the public thinks the schools are doing a better than average job, the media continue to hammer away at what the public opinion makers think to be all of the schools' failings.

The first soundings of this attack were actually heard in the early 1960's when critics of the schools like John Holt, Jonathan Kozol, Nat Hentoff, and Edgar Z. Friedenberg began publishing books which portrayed schools as grim fortresses of regimentation and conformity staffed with boring, insensitive teachers. In the view of these writers, the schools would do better if only the present teachers could be replaced with superior people more like themselves. These writers and others like them received much attention from the media and, by the end of the decade, their views were widely regarded as gospel among those who considered themselves enlightened on educational issues.

At the same time as academics and intellectuals were picking up this view and spreading it, the complementary notion that what really needed to be done was to wrest power from those now staffing and controlling the schools began to gain a foothold. In the late 1960's, big spenders like the Ford Foundation began putting large sums of money into exploring ways to decentralize large urban school systems. Playing on the dissatisfactions of the urban minorities and the poor who were witnessing the failures of promised but undelivered school integration, these pacesetters began to encourage the breakup of large city systems by emphasizing the importance of local control of schools, restoring faith in the neighborhood school concept, and revitalizing the idea that schools reflect the culture of their surrounding neighborhoods even if that might mean homogeneity and parochialism. Together, the school critics and moneyed urban liberals were pushing the view that the schools were no good and that what needed to be changed was the people in them and the way they are controlled.

The debate over school quality, which these developments started, was picked up and carried on by an education public which, ironically, owed its ability to be critical of education to the success of the very schools from which it had come to expect so much. As literacy has risen in this country, the general populous has become better equipped to criticize the source of its literacy: the public schools. As a result, teachers have moved from the position of being part of a very small elite that was looked up to by the rest of society to one in which they are regarded simply as equals or even among the less educated in very many communities.

The innovations syndrome in education has not added anything but suspicion to the current skepticism over the schools' performance. Parents and the public at large can be justifiably dubious about the value of a school system that each year proclaims that some new educational program will provide the answer to school failure. As more and more hardware, software, and curriculum packages have been produced by commercial educationists, the innovations cycle has speeded up to the point where one program is barely established than another has arrived to take its place. What this merry-go-round of ideas and programs does is simply to increase the public's wariness about school substance and its doubts that anything very meaningful is really known about education.

The lack of public confidence in education stemming from all of these developments was given an additional push by the appearance in the late 1960's of a number of widely publicized studies questioning school effectiveness. Equality of Educational Opportunity, more commonly known as the Coleman Report; Inequality; and the more recent studies of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement -- all raised questions about the relative importance of school when compared with other factors that may influence educational achievement such as socioeconomic and home background. Although these studies have been widely questioned and reinterpreted, their impact on the educational public has been profound. They have given academic weight to the predisposition of many to question the value of the schools -- a predisposition created by all of the other factors discussed above.

Whether or not the public's faith in its schools has been shaken for good reasons -- assuming that the doubts of the media and politicians are reflective of some degree of heightened skepticism among the public -- one thing is certain: the present atmosphere is having definite repercussions in the realm of educational politics. The questions being raised over the value of public education and, in turn, the effectiveness of teachers are directly behind moves toward accountability at the state and local levels. If the public is -- or is perceived to be -- suspicious and doubtful, then efficiency and productivity concerns become the easiest, most logical response of politicians.

It really is no surprise, given the fiscal concerns of the present administration and the heightened preoccupation with economy at the level of most state and local governments, that accountability with its systems management, measurement, and productivity goals has attracted so much attention recently. It is not the first time that the drive toward efficiency has led social scientists to push business models front and center nor is it the first time that decision makers have been willing to pick them up and use them -- a fact which Raymond Callahan has clearly pointed out in his book, Education and the Cult of Efficiency.

The most recent interest in such business-based notions as programming, planning, and budgeting (PPB); performance contracting; and their accompanying input-output models may trace back to the early implementation of managerial techniques in Robert McNamara's Pentagon during the Kennedy and Johnson years. The use of these techniques was apparently well-received and soon spread to other agencies of the federal government, including the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. J. Myron Atkin and James D. Raths trace the migration of these tools to the state level and into teacher education:

> While the current political mood in America diminishes some of the power of federal agencies, the techniques of program planning and management developed in Washington, then, have migrated to the individual states. It is somewhat ironic that at a time when Washington officials have become somewhat skeptical about the advantages of planning programming budgeting systems and operations research, particularly in the social sphere, state legislatures and state executive departments sustain undiminished enthusiasm for the techniques. One reason for the disparity between Washington and the state governments may be that Washington agencies have had more experience. But it is also probably a fact that the managerial techniques are used as much to cut costs as to improve policy. Accountability laws are passed in the various state legislatures partly as a method for developing a seemingly rational plan for executive and legislative decision-making that seems to require a reduction of expenditures.[3]

While Raths and Atkin may be wrong about the disenchantment of federal agencies with managerial approaches, they are certainly right in seeing a new state interest in them. Much of the attraction of the competency-based teacher education idea, with its focus on the school product of measured achievement, is due to its direct theoretical and practical relationship to the accountability movement.

Along with money and a new focus on federalized decision making reflected in such ideas as revenue sharing, accountability has moved to the state level. And, because teacher education and certification are traditionally areas of state authority, it is only natural that we should find accountability emerging in the form of business and measurement-based reforms in teacher training. In short, the "new federalism" and its accompanying emphasis on state decision making has moved into education in many forms: one of them is teacher preparation.

The money problems of states and the resulting interest in accountability and competency-based teacher education have been given added impetus by the questions now being raised regarding statewide funding formulas and the inequities arising from great variations in school district tax bases. Many states are faced with numerous court cases related to their distribution mechanisms and this problem compounds their discomfort over school funding. What better way is there to take up the gauntlet against these multiple pressures than to find a cheap answer within the traditional realm of state authority: teacher certification?

The political thrust of the competency movement also brings up questions relating to the value and meaning of job-qualifying credentials. Education as a basis for job qualification is under attack from those using the intellectual arguments presented by Christopher Jencks and company in Inequality and by Ivar Berg in Education, the Great Training Robbery. Essentially these authors argue that education level has very little to do with job performance and accomplishment. Those wishing to undermine credential systems based on education simply use these analyses to claim that such systems need reexamination and overhauling. Because hiring educated people raises the cost level of education, these notions give academic legitimacy to those searching for arguments to justify any measures that will provide for the hiring of less expensive and, consequently, less educated people. The courts have added the weight of such decisions as Griggs v. Duke Power Company which rule against the value of job-qualifying tests as true measures of predicted job performance.[4] The overall thrust of these decisions and arguments has been to throw out measures of qualification rather than perfecting or adding to those education-based requirements that now exist. Concerns for proportional or quota hiring of individuals on the basis of such ascribed characteristics as race or sex rather than achieved qualifications simply reenforces the sweep of thinking away from the traditional education-based method of training -- no matter how little is known of the value of the newer approaches.

Not to be ignored in this scenario of pressures is the growing popularity of behaviorism in the social sciences. The assumptions behaviorism makes about our ability to measure virtually all aspects of teaching and learning provides the theoretical underpinnings for attempts to look at teaching in terms of highly specific and supposedly measurable skills. Behaviorists believe that student achievement can be related to isolated teaching skills or groups of skills which have been clustered for purposes of accomplishing a specific task. The claim that this can be, or should be, done has been attacked, of course; but, given the present interest in measurement, most of those who raise questions are scarcely heard. One such critic, Harry S. Broudy, suggests, for example, that:

> . . . not the performance but the *state of mind* we call understanding is the crucial 'product' here. No single observable behavior is likely to be sufficient proof of such adequacy, for a state of mind is not expressible, except under extraordinary circumstances, in a single observable behavior. Skinner quite rightly doesn't worry about whether pigeons understand what they are doing so long as they do it. If, however, the way a situation is perceived or interpreted is in any way an *important* ingredient of teaching or learning, then verbal behavior or any other covert behavior, may not be sufficient indicators of either successful teaching or learning. In other words, performance-based teaching is in danger of capturing everything except what is most significant in many kinds of learning, viz., significance.[5]

Thoughts such as these have barely received acknowledgment from the competency enthusiasts since they require a much more complex interpretation of what teaching is all about.

In the midst of this political and theoretical reduction of the importance of schools and the meaning of teaching comes still another factor forcing the reexamination of teacher education -- demographic changes and the so-called "teacher surplus." Now that the post World War II baby boom children have passed through and out of the school system, the schools are experiencing a marked decline in enrollment. Because school boards have chosen to cut staffs rather than deploy them so as to improve the personnel resources of schools, there are now many more teachers than there are jobs. Some experts have estimated, in fact, that if teacher education schools keep turning out students at the same rate as at present, there may shortly be two teachers for every available job.[6]

One side of effect of this job picture has been the tendency of teachers who have jobs to stay put and this, in turn, has meant a general rise in average teacher salaries -- cause for concern among money-minded school boards and all the more reason for them to seek out new programs which might provide a rationale for stimulating staff turnover and bringing in newer, less expensive people. Because the competency-based approaches have clear implications for the possibility of new recertification as well as certification mechanisms, school boards are anxious to have education schools take them seriously.

The education schools themselves have moved quickly to greet the new interest in competency-based teacher education. Given their continuing failure to adequately prepare teachers and their need for some *modus vivendi* that will enable them to keep operating in this period of demographic crunch, many teacher education colleges have jumped at the opportunity to get on the new bandwagon rather than switch their energies to in-service education, which would probably make more sense. Many of these schools have opted to advertise their interest in the new thinking as one way of trying to insure survival.

Competency-based teacher education is clearly an idea whose time has come. Whether or not it is a good idea is a question that seems to get lost behind all of the political and economic pressures it has going for it. Nor is it likely that serious thought will be given to the real meaning of teaching it espouses when the forces of "new federalism," accountability, efficiency, anticredentialing, and behaviorism combine to push virtually all thinking on teacher education in one direction.

Given all of this pressure, there is at least one course of action which competency advocates owe the public before launching into full scale implementation of programs: further research. For if competency approaches are to be tried, the least its supporters should be held responsible for is some evidence that they have a positive effect through teaching, on the way children grow and learn. The public deserves some clearer understanding of what the whole idea is about -- not only in theory, but in the way it has been implemented by those who extol its virtues. One question is whether there is any substance in practice to back up all the talk about improved performance and better teaching. Another question is whether, if the method does have substance, it is the kind of substance we want to concentrate on. Answers to these questions should have a bearing on decisions regarding how widely competency approaches should be practiced as well as on what other teacher training ideas might be worth trying.

Section II

The Competency Doctrine Spelled Out -- Abstract Definitions and Program Realities

One of the problems in defining any broad-based social change movement is that each group at interest tends to have its own notion of what constitutes the true gospel. The competency movement is no exception. Consequently, its meaning is diluted considerably by the fact that every interested party has some special idea of what it really means or should mean. What started as a fairly specific idea, with firm attachments to behavioral psychology, has taken on a new rhetoric that attempts to include the affective domains as well as the cognitive ones. The move to broaden the definition has received added impetus from the hovering threat of college-initiated court actions based on academic freedom and the grim implications the competency doctrine holds for liberal education. What remains a real question is whether or not these attempts to stretch the definition can work or whether they are just so much public relations rhetoric. A look at some of the programs should provide the answer.

Before analyzing any definition it helps to know who is doing the defining. Among the current popularizers of the approach are such organizations as the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Education (led by Theodore Andrews, a New York State Education Department official), the National Commission on Performance-Based Education (sponsored by the Educational Testing Service and funded to date by the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation), the National Consortium on CBE Centers, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and, of course, the Office of Education, which can be counted on to join and to lead any bandwagons in education (especially the Teacher Corps division and the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems). The National Institute of Education is continuing to put money into research in this area (1.7 million in the 1976 budget). Among the vested interests behind these various organizations are state education department staffs; some college professors, particularly those involved in teacher education research; certain teacher training institutions which want to carve out a role for themselves; federal bureaucrats seeking to make some mark in education; and major foundations who are willing to back up all the rest with cash. (See Table 1.)

One of the widely known definitions of competency-based education emerging from this group is the one put forward by Stanley Elam in the first of a long series of monographs on the subject published by the AACTE. In Performance-Based Teacher Education, What is the State of the Art? Elam says that a program is performance-based if 1) the competencies (knowledges, skills, and behavior) to be demonstrated are derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles expressed in such a way as to allow for assessment of a student's behavior; 2) the assessment of competencies performed is based on explicit criteria related to specific conditions and specific competencies; 3) such assessment attempts to be objective, includes evidence of a student's knowledge, and uses performance as the primary source of evidence; 4) the rate of progress through a program is based on competency rather than time or course completion; and 5) the instructional program is oriented toward the evaluation and achievement of specified competencies. Elam also emphasizes that these definitions, processes, and expectations should be made public before a program is put into operation.

Among the other definitions being tossed about is one put forward by Allen Schmieder in another AACTE monograph. He says that performance-based teacher education is:

> A teacher education program where the learning outcomes and the indicators acceptable as evidence of the realization of these outcomes, is specified and made public. (This type of program is sometimes used as the basis for certification of new teachers.) Learning outcomes may be evidenced at:
> 1. The knowledge level (the result of interacting with "protocol" materials),
> 2. The skill level (the result of interacting with "training" materials),
> 3. The output level (the result of interacting with "integrating" materials),
> 4. The performance level (the behavior of the teacher),
> 5. The consequence level (the behavior of the pupils).[7]

TABLE 1

CBTE PROJECTS, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND USOE EXPENDITURE*

Project/Group	Type of Activity	Total USOE Expenditure (August 1967 to January 1973)
Elementary Teacher Education Models (research)	Phase I planning; Phase II feasibility studies to design 10 new models of teacher education	$ 3,000,000
National Consortium of CBTE Developers (Teacher Corps)	Directors of Models Project currently focusing on development; providing leadership	250,000
Southern Consortium (Teacher Corps)	Developing local models and disseminating them to small colleges interested in CBTE	50,000
Multi-State Consortium (Title V, ESEA)	Studying implications of state certification and training programs; developing management systems	50,000
Leadership Training Institute (NCIES)	Developing teacher centers (now renamed CBTE Centers) at sites of Model Project Directors; developing materials	200,000
Task Force '72 (NCIES)	Promoting "national dialogue" on CBTE; disseminating information; assisting in program implementation	1,900,000
Committee on National Program Priorities (research)	Developing five-year national CBTE program	60,000
Texas State Project (NCIES)	Developing statewide implementation of CBTE	1,500,000
The Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education (NCIES)	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education serving as clearinghouse of information	400,000
Teacher Corps Program Development Specialists	Teacher Corps staff development and implementation of CBTE component	4,000,000
Technical Assistance	Special projects with Teacher Corps; national and regional conferences	800,000
		$12,210,000

*"Competency Based Teacher Education," by Phyllis D. Hamilton, prepared for the U.S. Office of Education by Stanford Research Institute, Menloe Park California, July, 1973, p. 12.

The National Commission on Performance-Based Education, a collection of public figures, teacher organization representatives, and researchers is still trying to come up with a definition of competency, a problem its members continued to grapple with at their February 1975 meeting.[8]

If one can wade through the professional jargon -- language intended to awe-inspire and confound the uninitiated over what are really very mundane thoughts, most of this is nothing more than an attempt to characterize teaching and all of its various intangible aspects in terms of what some think can be measured and controlled. All of the talk about explicitness, objectivity, and outcomes presumes, despite evidence to the contrary, that teaching can be analyzed scientifically if it is broken down into a multiplicity of definite observable pieces.

Some competency advocates have attempted to deal with the criticism that the movement is trying to oversimplify and overmeasure teaching by reducing it to the observable, more cognitive aspects of a teacher's activity. Vincent Gazzetta, a New York State Education Department official, has argued, for example, that New York state's definition of competency-based education incorporates both the measurable, skill aspects of teaching as well as its more intangible affective elements. He says that the definition being used by the state:

> . . . does not preclude the preparation of dull, grey robots but neither does it restrict the preparation of professional staff whose competencies are embedded in descriptive terms such as joy, zest, curiousity, awe, wonder or humor. I've identified both ends of the continuum and have done so purposefully. New York's definition of a competency-based system must be able to accommodate both ends as well as everything in between.[9]

In suggesting that broader programs that give weight to the affective domain can indeed fit New York state's requirement that competency-based programs be defined in terms of "skills, knowledges and attitudes," Gazzetta goes on to say:

> Granted there are problems of assessment and evaluation inherent in such a program, but I am told there are many programs of preparation in New York that fully embody the humanistic approach and have done so for years. It seems reasonable to me to assume that if "humanistic concerns" were and are the focus of programs then, in some way, the program knows what it expects and has ways of knowing whether its expectations are being met.[10]

The problem is that the affective end of Gazzetta's continuum includes qualities which simply are not measurable. The competency-behavioral shoe will not stretch to fit all aspects of teaching. We can predict that competency advocates will be forced to either make claims for their system which it cannot fulfill and thereby engage in hyprocrisy or they will be forced to give lip-service to affective concerns while concentrating their real energies on the technical aspects of teaching. A look at some college programs should indicate whether or not this prediction is true.

The initiative of colleges in taking up performance-based teacher education as a basis for developing new programs has come from essentially two sources: Some have done it largely because of state requirements in the form of laws or mandates and others have been attracted to it because they want to be leaders in the new movement. It is useful to look at examples of both types of programs since the pressures, motivations, and resources involved in developing them are quite different.

Thirteen sample performance-based programs are discussed in an AACTE monograph called Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description. These programs are good representative examples of what the leaders of the competency-based movement had in mind since all but two of them received some sort of federal, state, or foundation funding in their developmental stages and since AACTE chose to highlight them. (Weber State College, for example, received a $200,000 grant from the Carnegie Foundation. This enabled the college's entire education faculty to take off seven months to develop the program.) The monograph makes a number of generalizations about these programs rather than dealing with each one in detail, but such generalizations serve as good indicators of what vanguard teacher education colleges in the performance-based field are doing.

> Activities carried on in these programs are quite similar. All have some kind of instructional package which requires decision-making, self-actualization, and individualized work on the part of the student. Variations are found in the quantity of packages available, the way they are sequenced, and the number and type required, i.e. proficiency modules which are combined into larger units called clusters. This arrangement is similar for SUCB (State University College at Buffalo), TCCU (Teachers College, Columbia University), and BYU (Brigham Young University). WSC's (Weber State College's) Wilkits are developed around a number of objectives which are combined into one Wilkit. UTEP's (University of Texas') program is divided into three cores into which are programmed instructional modules. The number of the materials vary as do the expected outcomes. Most are in terms of teacher performance, although some attempt to specify outcomes in terms of pupil activity.[11]

Though it is almost impossible to know what all of this means in terms of substance, one thing is certain: specification and measurement are high priorities. A few samples of the kinds of "objectives" these programs try to employ make this even clearer, especially those pathetically attempting to deal with the affective domain:

> *Cognitive Objective:* The student will be able to write, in a class setting without the use of aid, a definition of the term operant conditioning which is adjudged accurate. (Knowledge criteria are applied in assessing competence.)
>
> *Affective Objective.* The student will demonstrate his concern for persons in the lower socioeconomic groups by voluntarily spending at least two hours per week working in a social service

agency. (Because of the nature of the affective domain, measurement criteria in this area are not usually discussed in advance with the student; should they be, the objective might be thought of as an expressive objective; performance criteria are used.)

Psychomotor Objective. The student will demonstrate his competency by writing ten words on the chalkboard in such a manner that three impartial judges agree that a minimal level of performance has been accomplished. (Performance criteria are used to determine mastery.)

Demonstrative Objective. The student will demonstrate one competency in the indirect teaching approach by the following: given a subject and one day to prepare a fifteen minute lesson, the student will present said lesson in such a manner as to manifest indirect teaching behaviors as defined in the Flanders interaction analysis system. (The objective is the demonstration of teaching behaviors; performance criteria are applied in assessing mastery.)

Consequential Objective. The student will demonstrate one competency in teaching mathematics by the following: given three eight-year-old pupils who have not mastered division by one digit, the student will successfully teach said pupils division by one digit in a period of not less than three weeks; success is described as ninety-percent-accuracy upon the part of two of the three pupils. (The objective is the demonstration of changes in pupil behavior; product criteria are applied in assessing competence.)

Expressive Objective. The student will visit the home of each of his pupils at least once during the school year.[12]

Such "objectives" hardly make for breadth and depth. The narrow measurement emphasis is so crudely drafted that any teacher or prospective teacher who took it seriously would be indicating crucial ignorance of a number of areas that affect learning. What if the three students learning math, for example, come to school hungry every morning, have parents who are constantly fighting, share a household with five other children, and are nearsighted but have no glasses? Might these factors not affect their ability to learn division by one digit in three weeks time? How should the extra time required be estimated? For what should the teacher be held responsible in such an instance? Objectives such as these are simply ludicrous and educators who propose them simply make a mockery of the profession. And these ideas, it must be remembered, are coming from people who have extra time and money to think about the meaning of teaching.

Sample assessment procedures coming from these schools are equally shallow and simplistic. Part of the student assessment form from Western Washington State College in Bellingham, Washington has a section on "interaction," for example. Students are rated on a three-measure scale including the categories "not demonstrated," "minimum level," and "advanced level" on such items as the following:

Individualizes . . .

- by preassessing pupil abilities
  - preassess both competence and perceived purpose
- by redesigning strategies after assessment
  - including three sets of plans for different pupils

Interacts with Pupils to Elicit Specified Behavior, i.e. --

- Elicit evidence that pupils accept or value task
  - pupils change from accepting to valuing task
- Elicit frequent, appropriate responses
  - obtain comprehension-level responses from at least half of pupils within 30 minutes[13]

Where does such a scale give room for the individual differences of the pupils being taught or the school conditions in which instruction takes place or the comprehension level at which the students started or any infinite variety of other factors that might enter into a teaching-learning situation?

If this is the kind of thinking that money is being spent on in teacher education, it might be interesting to look at a few programs developed in New York state where, by state mandate, all colleges must restructure their teacher training programs along competency-based lines without supplementary funds. With the exception of twelve trial projects which had to share a meager $100,000 this year, no college in the state has been provided with extra funds to aid in the development of new programs. Faculties have not been given adequate time for planning and public school teachers involved in the planning process have not been given either released time or payment for their efforts.

Some colleges, like Queens College of the City University of New York, have simply imported much of their thinking from somewhere else. The Queens program for a Master of Science in Education degree calls for an assessment plan developed by the University of Toledo competency-based program.[14] (Curiously, while colleges like Queens are picking up the thinking of leaders in the movement such as the University of Toledo, these same universities are going through a reanalysis of their original suggestions. This will be pointed out more specifically later in the paper.)

Among the evaluation tools included in the Toledo system are: conferences, cumulative records, demonstration, examinations, interviews, observations, operation performance, questionnaire techniques, reports, self-appraisal, sociometric techniques, special assignments and exercises, and peer-group evaluations. While Queens claims that these are the assessment devices its faculty will use, the discussion of individual competencies often includes little more in the way of suggested evaluation than "assessment by classroom instructor or reader."

As for the competencies themselves, Queens College has managed to translate everything from the study of Plato to the organization of blocks into competency terms. A sample competency in the graduate foundations program might include, the following, for example:

COMPETENCY	CONDITIONS	BEHAVIOR	CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT
Student understands major assumptions and/or beliefs of 3 philosopners of education who lived prior to 1900	Give a 1,500 word take home essay	student analyzes sections concerning education in Books 6 & 7 of Plato's Republic	(1) gives examples of the 4 intellectual activities discussed in the section concerning the line. (2) summarizes the allegory of the cave and gives two arguments showing how the notions of "conversion" and "blindness when suddenly confronted with truth" do not apply to his students. (3) states 2 ways in which Plato's view of mathematics and its relation to science differs from that of a typical 20th century scientist. (4) states 3 ways in which Plato's view of the curriculum, role of the teacher and the freedom of choice possessed by the child differs from the views of an open classroom advocate on the same 3 topics. Acceptable - student performs 3 of the above tasks	Classroom instructor and/or reader

Thankfully, block-building does not lend itself as easily to such mutilation as the liberal arts.

The Queens College program uses hundreds and hundreds of such competencies with varying degrees of specificity. The possibility that such a program will be "in danger of capturing everything except that which is most significant in many kinds of learning," to use Harry Broudy's observation, seems very great. The observers, the evaluators, and the performers themselves might well become so engrossed in the act of performance that the meaning of what they are doing will be lost.

The problems of measurement emerge even more clearly when some of these programs attempt to deal with "performance" on the formulation of "attitudes." Because the New York state mandate calls for defining competencies in terms of "knowledges, skills, and attitudes," some colleges have actually attempted to formulate competency attitudes. City College in New York City places the competency "understands meaning of citizenship in a democracy" under the classification "attitude." The "demonstrable behavior associated with the competency" is that the teacher "fosters a sense of responsibility and participation among children." At least the drafters of this incredible example of vagueness and rhetoric had the sense not to try coming up with anything precise in the way of evaluation. The "assessment procedure" listed calls primarily for staff observation without giving any idea whatsoever of what is to be observed. Another "attitude" requires that the prospective teacher "demonstrate respect for and awareness of other cultures and different ethnic groups." The "demonstrable behavior" required is that the teacher "avoid cliches during instruction" and "show awareness of and respect for other cultures."[15] Once again the assessment procedure depends primarily on observation. Since everyone knows that even today's most ardent racists tend to avoid using ethnic cliches, the presumed connection between "demonstrable behavior" and achieved "attitude" seems totally unfounded.

The examples are endless and the pattern is the same. A York College competency program, for example, calls for competencies like the following:

Conditions and Behavior	Critical Evaluation	Assessed by
Given a stated math objective and a specified group of children, the student teaches the prepared lesson using instructional aids to develop the concept	The observed lesson reflects adherence to the prepared lesson plan previously evaluated, involves active participation by the children, and results in achievement of the stated objective	College teacher

Given 5 types of standardized reading tests (readiness, achievement, diagnostic, oral, study skills), the student administers one of each to his or her peers.	Follows manual directions accurately in regard to test administration, scoring, and interpretation; writes a report citing results, interpretation, and implications for reading instruction based on each test	College professors observe test administration, check scoring, and evaluate written reports[16]

If there is any real difference between the New York programs and the others discussed here, it may be in their evaluation or assessment procedures. Some of the colleges which have led in the field or have attempted to adhere more closely to the doctrine of competency have been more venturesome in their efforts to relate teaching competency to student performance with or without any meaningful tools for doing this. Many of the New York programs and other programs developed without any resources have, on the other hand, used the language of competency in outlining what it is their students should be able to do but have side-stepped the evaluation question by deferring to college faculties and public school staffs in assessing the progress of student teachers. What these colleges have done is to make attempts at specificity without developing criteria meaningful in terms of evaluation. This failure has serious implications for the definition of competency and for the claims of its supporters that it can incorporate the affective aspects of education as well as the more measurable cognitive ones. Some competency thinkers at the University of Toledo have made reference to the evaluation problem, a problem which challenges all the measurement assumptions of the movement:

> . . . it is obvious that the effects of competency-based programs must be measured through primary criteria. Teacher, administrator, and student opinions are not sufficient to determine whether a learner has reached competency in a particular knowledge, skill, or understanding. . . Put another way, a CBTE program that does not have a match between its instructional objectives and primary criteria for determining how well those objectives are met, does not have a competency-based teacher education program. Most of the major CBTE programs we have examined have not sufficiently matched criteria to these instructional objectives. All of them are at approximations less than sufficient to determine the competency of their students. This can only mean that the CBTE programs are using secondary criteria to assess their effects. If history is any indicator, CBTE programs are vulnerable.[17]

Two things seem clear. To begin with, those interested in this particular brand of teacher education are trying to define teacher education in the narrow terms of measurement. But, despite the lip-service support of Vincent Gazzetta and others for the idea that competency can accommodate broader approaches, those writing the programs will be hard-pressed to accomplish this. Secondly, the resulting inability of program developers to come up with evaluation or assessment techniques relating teacher performance and student achievement in the programs they are writing betrays the underlying weakness of the entire performance-based thrust, a weakness teacher organizations have been pointing to ever since the idea came up. There simply is no research which clearly relates teacher behavior or performance to student success.

Luckily there still are a few educational researchers who are continuing to point out the extremely weak research basis for the competency movement. An article by Robert W. Heath and Mark A. Nielson in the fall issue of the American Educational Research Association's Review of Educational Research reviews the reviewers on this subject and finds:

> The performance-based-teacher-education model does not recognize two important types of variables. It ignores *what* is to be taught. Though the studies reviewed here were concerned with everything from aircraft mechanics to reading, no effort is apparent in identifying the possible interactions between teacher-behavior variables and content. It seems unlikely that *one* set of teaching behaviors is most effective for teaching everything. If there is an important interaction between type of content and teaching behavior (given cognitive achievement as criteria), then the conclusion about which teaching behavior is effective may be determined as much by content as by teacher behavior.
>
> The model ignored *who* is to be taught. Despite persistent evidence that variables such as socioeconomic status and ethnic status are more important determinants of average achievement level than teacher behavior, the research on teacher-behavior variables largely ignores such differences among students. Similarly, the studies cited by Rosenshine and Furst cover a wide student age range (preschool to adult), yet the idea that effective teacher behavior might be different for different age groups is ignored when conclusions are drawn from such collections. It seems unlikely that one set of teacher behaviors is most effective for teaching everything to everybody. . .[18]
>
> . . .
>
> Our analysis of this literature leads us to three conclusions:
> First, the research literature on the relation between teacher behavior and student achievement does not offer an empirical basis for the prescription of teacher-training objectives.
>
> Second, this literature fails to provide such a basis, not because of minor flaws in the statistical analysis, but because of sterile operational definitions of both teaching and achievement, and because of fundamentally weak research designs.
>
> Last, given the well-documented, strong association between student achievement and variables such as socioeconomic status

and ethnic status, the effects of techniques of teaching on achievement (as these variables are defined in the PBTE research) are likely to be inherently trivial.[19]

One of the main things that is obviously needed, then, is better research. Before states like New York, California, Texas, Washington, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, and Vermont begin pushing competency-based programs upon their teacher education schools, as all of them are now doing in various forms,[20] such research must be done.

But issues related to defining teaching competence itself and the research base on which it rests do not even encompass all the problems of defining the movement as it exists in practice. In some states, like New York, a restructuring of the governance of teacher education is also an inherent part of the competency-based movement. Proponents of competency-based education have taken pains to confuse issues of governance with issues of substance and merge them into one, even though they do not necessarily belong together. Theoretically, a new form of governance for teacher education does not necessarily mean that the programs arrived at must be competency-based. In New York state the two have been put together by Regents' mandate and State Education Department directives even though their merits can be considered separately.

Two aspects of the new look at teacher education which teachers have supported are clearly governance rather than "competency" issues: 1) cooperative governance of teacher education -- the recognition of the need to involve teachers and the public schools in teacher education through new structures such as consortium or collaborative governance; and 2) the realization that teacher education needs to be more field-centered than previously. Even though these two components of the present reform have nothing to do with the theoretical basis of the competency drive, they have commonly been considered to be inherent parts of it in practice.

What all of this discussion of both the theoretical and practical aspects of the competency-based movement leaves us with is a composite definition of competency-based teacher education as it exists and a series of problems which are as yet unsolved. Competency-based teacher education today would seem to consist of the following:

1. A concern for what is measurable in teaching (and for attempting to define that which may not be measurable or which has not yet been measured in measurable terms).

2. Acceptance of the desirability, and possibility, of measuring teacher performance in terms of student achievement.

3. Emphasis on the cognitive (measurable) results of teaching over the affective.

4. A tendency to analyze the teaching act in terms of bits and pieces.

5. A preoccupation with tangible objectives -- valuing product over process.

6. A recognition of the need to involve teachers and the public schools in teacher education reform resulting in new cooperative governance structures for teacher education.

7. Recognition of the need for teacher education to be more field-centered than previously.

8. A preoccupation with the way teachers teach resulting in neglect for the importance of the way students learn or of how schools affect teacher-learner interaction.

As a working definition these points and the way they have been attended to leave teacher educators with a number of important problems to resolve:

- The need for an adequate research base from which to develop sound programs
- The need for special funding to enable colleges, teachers, and the public schools to work up valuable programs once a research base is established
- The need for released time or compensation for all those involved in teacher education reform
- The need for accurate assessment and evaluative techniques based on research to determine the relative success of newly trained students
- The need to define and delimit those aspects of teaching and learning which can, in fact, be measured
- The need to consider other ways of reforming teacher education than following the competency-based movement
- The need to relate all of the above to a meaningful, integrated concept of teaching.

Section III

Cautions and Other Options

There are really two kinds of considerations that must go into deciding whether or not the competency-based movement will have an impact on improving the quality of teacher education. One has to do with evaluating the movement itself and making recommendations which might improve it. The other involves looking generally at what is wrong with teacher education and coming up with additional reform programs whether or not they have anything to do with performance or competency approaches. In doing these things, all the relevant interest groups -- teachers, education schools, researchers, and the various governmental bodies involved -- will have to look carefully at all of the present political ramifications of the rush into competency-based education, especially given its obvious weaknesses.

Teachers are well aware, for example, of the way fiscal conservatism, using the competency movement as a vehicle, can be used to attack them. Propagators of the approach must acknowledge the legitimacy of these concerns and, if they are serious about perfecting it, cannot simply push unvalidated programs because the political situation allows for and even encourages such action. Teachers will refuse to become the scapegoats for school failure by way of competency-based education. Among those aspects of the movement they will continue to question and take a firm negative position on are:

- *Any competency-based efforts to implement recertification, differentiated staffing, or dilution of tenure provisions.*
- *Attempts to water down the knowledge base now necessary for teaching.*
- *Evaluation of teachers on the basis of student achievement without considering all the home, school, and other factors which may affect student success.*
- *Attempts to turn too much responsibility for teacher certification over to local school districts through consortia or collaborative governance mechanisms.*
- *Any infringement on the rights of classroom teachers which may be implied or demanded of cooperating teachers working with competency-based college programs.*
- *Attempts to add to the working day of teachers by expecting them to serve on program reform committees without compensatory time or payment.*

Education schools, researchers, and others interested in the improvement of teacher preparation must examine their own reactions to the competency movement in the light of these legitimate reactions of teachers. Education schools, for example, must decide whether or not they want to join what now amounts to a bandwagon even though no serious research exists to provide a sound basis for what is being done. They must face the implications of shared governance squarely and decide what kinds of relationships they intend to develop with local school districts and teacher organizations. They must decide among options which include court action, the broadening of a research role for teacher education schools, and the development of alliances with teacher organizations (the creation of the Teacher Education Conference Board in New York state is one such example), or they can simply join the bandwagon and reap the whirlwind if other groups, most likely teachers, take the lead in redirecting teacher education.

Researchers are faced with a similar set of options. They can choose to become advocates of performance-based approaches before the research is done and thus discredit themselves as serious scientists. Many have already done this. Or, they can decide to remain outside the debate over the merits of the competency movement, neglecting even to point out what is known or unknown about the relationship between student performance and teacher behavior. Should they choose this course of action they will be abdicating their responsibility to inform the public on research matters having to do with public policy while, at the same time, perpetuating the aloof and somewhat irrelevant role educational researchers have historically played vis-a-vis educational decisions. A more positive choice would be for them to become advocates of expanding the range of research in the area by figuring out ways of joining with teacher organizations and other interested parties to determine how this could best be done.

Whatever these groups ultimately decide, they certainly will not be able to ignore what teachers are saying about the substantive weaknesses of the competency movement and the apparent political motivations which form the backbone of its support. By insisting on a serious research effort before policy decisions are made, teachers are recognizing the potential of competency approaches while at the same time pointing out what is necessary before anyone can take the new thinking seriously. As it is now, because there is no research to tell us which competencies are valid, the selection of which competencies are to be required could change from year to year depending on the political wishes and financial circumstances of states and local school boards. Teachers are well aware that, with these changes, might come the abolition of teacher tenure and the implementation of recertification plans based on ever changing notions of competency. The new competency mechanisms may well subject teachers to a whole new series of groundless political pressures that have very little to do with education or good teacher training but which would help states and school districts save money.

With expanded research as the basis of a truly professional response to the doctrine of competency, teachers and others should consider the merits of the following points as part of a comprehensive position on performance- or competency-based teacher education. Following these points should protect the profession from premature, politically motivated erosion of standards while at the same time improving upon much of the shallow thinking that now surrounds the competency movement:

- *Insistence on serious research before any state legislates or mandates performance- or competency-based education.* Such research should first take a thorough look at teaching and, with the help of experienced teachers, develop a total concept of what constitutes good teaching. Teaching factors must be isolated from student and school factors to find out what it is about teaching that contributes to student progress. Classroom teachers must be involved at all levels of such research.

- *Requiring that a college education be a prerequisite for teaching.* While we may know little about "competency," we do know that teachers have to know something about a subject to be able to teach it and should have a broad liberal arts background to be able to make sound judgments regarding school content and the experience of students in schools.

- *The use of qualifying exams in making minimal judgments on teacher preparation.* At least the present knowledge requirements for entry into the profession must be maintained. Such requirements exist for the professions of both medicine and law and we do know enough about what knowledge is necessary for teachers to be able to test for it. Behavior or performance simply cannot become substitutes for the need to know something.

- *Insistence that teaching be viewed as a complex process with multiple goals rather than a series of simplistic acts aimed at the product of student achievement.* A preoccupation with student achievement neglects the need of teachers to focus attention on students' emotional and social growth and unfairly implies that teachers alone are responsible for student success.

- *Insistence that teacher organizations be involved in all aspects of teacher education development and research if teaching is to become more truly professional.*

If these factors constitute a response to the competency movement, they certainly do not represent a comprehensive approach to teacher education reform. One of the side effects of the whole debate over competency and performance is the neglect of other potentially successful teacher training proposals. There is no reason why the field-centered and shared governance ideas which have been identified with the performance movement cannot be used to encourage other forms of change in teacher preparation. The American Federation of Teachers has a number of ideas to propose in this area. In fact, the governance changes and the ideas associated with field-centered programs have arisen largely because of the pressures of teachers to have a greater say in the matter of their own professional training. In addition, much of what the AFT thinks is worth trying is based on the fact that there *already is* much excellent teaching going on in the schools which simply needs to be tapped for effective use in teacher training.

One idea now being refined by the AFT, for example, is an internship program in which fully paid, fully qualified teachers begin their teaching careers with a partial teaching load and use the rest of their teaching day for supportive conferences and seminars. Their classroom responsibilities could increase over the course of a probationary period so that by the time they were carrying a full load they would have achieved tenured appointment. The medical internship serves as a model for this idea since it is based on the proven success of combining thorough knowledge with practical experience to create capable professionals. Medical schools recognize that the experience and skill of professionals already in a field is perhaps the best source of expertise in developing trainees.

Teachers have also been interested in the development of teachers' centers which could play both pre-service and in-service teacher training roles. The teachers' center idea is aimed at remedying the effects of one of the problems teachers suffer from throughout their careers: teacher isolation. That teachers have little contact with one another is a fact well known by teachers themselves and well recognized by observers of the school scene. It is surprising, given the size of the profession and the fact that it operates in a community work place, the school, that teachers function in relative isolation. In comparing teaching to the professions of medicine and law, Robert Dreeben, author of an insightful book called The Nature of Teaching, notes that teachers develop much less of a "collegial" or collective professional sense of identity than either medical students or law students. This lack of collegiality is due, he says, to the much looser, less demanding structure of teacher education. It carries over into the school setting where classrooms tend to function as isolated units and there is little else in the school structure to encourage teacher sharing. As a result, teachers may tend to develop self-reliant postures which lead them to unnecessarily repeat through trial and error what their colleagues in the next corridor might easily be able to tell them.[21]

A teachers' center where teachers could come to share ideas, get advice, and even work on helping to define teaching based on experienced professional judgment is another teacher training model worth trying. Here the emphasis would be on in-service training, an area that should have even greater priority given the low entry possibilities in teaching today. Besides, there is no reason that the teachers' center approach could not serve as both an in-service and a pre-service tool because virtually everyone recognizes the need to relate pre-service and on-the-job teacher experiences more closely. Teachers' centers might also be viewed as a meeting ground for beleaguered education schools, which simply must move into the area of in-service education if they are to survive, and the organized profession, which is anxious to find meaningful in-service programs.

In short, the product-oriented assumptions now being made on our ability to relate student achievement to teacher performance must be challenged and the present misuse of performance-based programs to undermine the respectability of the teaching profession must be stopped, especially given the minimal knowledge base of all of those now proselytizing the religion of competency. In the meantime, the parties at interest can, and should, get together to explore the potentials of competency-based education through research. They should also try out and research some other kinds of teacher training approaches such as internship programs and teachers' centers.

Conclusion

Politics has, at least up until now, given meaning and impetus to the drive for competency- or performance-based teacher education. The historical weaknesses of education -- the fact that we still do not know very much about it as a process -- has given politics the upper hand in determining what will go on. In recent times the whims of the Nixon-Ford administration have had more to do with decisions in education than meaningful evaluations of substance or process. In teacher training this political influence -- with its emphasis on state authority, cost-consciousness, accountability, and product -- has provided the foundations on which the competency-based movement has been built.

Too few educators realize the degree to which their notions of what should be done, or how roles should be perceived, are related to such things as the availability of resources like money and the political ramifications of that availability. Only a very few would be inclined to see the linkages between the popularity of behaviorism in the social sciences and the growing enthusiasm for business models and productivity systems. Even the concept of the teacher -- as either a thinking, knowing, judging person or one who is able to successfully imitate prescribed competencies -- can be influenced by the larger political and economic picture. Competency-based teacher education is popular *now* not because it is a good thing but because it fits the needs of the economy-minded period.

This is not to say that the concept is totally worthless. Rather, the competency approach needs to be looked at, as do a whole range of possible alternatives. Its underlying assumptions and the values that go with them need examination. Those making decisions in teacher education should know what their choices are and they should have some *information* on the merits of each choice as well as its meaning. The flimsiness of current definitions of competency and the inherent weaknesses of the present programs which back them up should be known. Their flaws can be exposed with an eye toward determining ways of perfecting the approach (i.e., research) rather than with the aim of destroying it.

In the meantime, the vindictive political implications which the competency movement has for people already in the field and those innocently entering it will be fought. Teachers will not stand for an attack on tenure and certification, a reordering of staffing patterns, the implementation of new forms of teacher evaluation or anything else which may impinge on their rights -- especially when such moves come from as shaky an intellectual and knowledge base as the competency movement. While they are criticizing and attacking misapplications of the competency idea, teachers will work on teacher education reform using the best of the competency approaches as well as the internship and teachers' center ideas of their own, ideas geared more to the concept of teaching as a process than as behaviors aimed at a product.

In short, we must keep looking at teaching. The competency or performance ideas must be explored, to be sure, but so must some other approaches. Ultimately we must hope to gain some real knowledge of what is best -- of what really makes an effective teacher. Otherwise, teachers, parents, and children will continue to be the victims of whatever new idea about teaching blows in with each new political breeze. The result will be a public suspicious of schools and unwilling to support even those things we do know are of benefit to children. If this public is to be reassured of the value of schooling and the importance of teaching, a long-range view requires that we stop spreading ideas like competency-based teacher education before we really know anything about them and settle down to getting some real answers.

Footnotes

[1] Allen A. Schmieder, "Profile of the States in Competency-Based Education," PBTE 3, 5 (November 1974): 2-24.

[2] George H. Gallup, "Sixth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes toward Education," Phi Delta Kappan 56, 1 (September 1974): 28.

[3] J. Myron Atkin and James D. Rath, Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in the United States, A Report prepared for the Directorate for Scientific Affairs (Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, February 1974), p. 2.

[4] Sheila Huff, "Credentialing by Tests or by Degrees: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and Griggs v. Duke Power Company," Harvard Educational Review 44, 2 (May 1974): 246-247.

[5] Harry S. Broudy, A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education, PBTE Monograph Series #4 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May 1972), p. 11.

[6] New York Times, June 16, 1974, p. 16, "New Graduates Seeking to Teach Are Said to Outnumber Jobs by 2 to 1."

[7] Allen A. Schmieder, Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene, PBTE Monograph Series #9 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1973), p. 63.

[8] "The Meaning of Teaching Competence and Competency-Based Education, for Discussion" (Princeton, New Jersey: National Commission of Performance-Based Education, February 1975).

[9] Vincent C. Gazzetta, Is This What We Want?, The Report of a Conference on Performance-Based Teacher Education (Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University Press, November 1973), p. 4.

[10] Ibid., p. 5.

[11] Iris M. Elfenbein, Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description, PBTE Monograph Series #8 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, October 1972), p. 62.

[12] Ibid., pp. 63-65.

[13] Ibid., p. 76.

[14] Master of Science in Education Program (New York: Queens College of the City University of New York, February 1, 1975), p. 37.

[15] City College Program on Competency-Based Education (New York: City College of the City University of New York, January 1975), unpaged.

[16] A Competency-Based Undergraduate Program for Preparing Elementary Teachers, N-6 (New York: York College of the City University of New York, January 1975), unpaged.

[17] Cass Gentry, Thomas Dunn et al., "For Want of an Assessment System, CBTE Programs are Lost," PBTE 3, 3 (September 1974): 1.

[18] Robert W. Heath and Mark A. Nielson, "The Research Basis for Performance Based Teacher Education," Review of Educational Research 44, 4 (Fall 1974): 476-477.

[19] Ibid., 480-481.

[20] Allen A. Schmieder, "Profile of the States in Competency-Based Education," 2-24.

[21] Robert Dreeben, The Nature of Teaching (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970), pp. 137-144.

Bibliography

Adelphi University. *Is This What We Want?* A Report on a Conference on Performance-Based Teacher Education. Garden City, N.Y.: Adelphi University Press, November 1973.

Atkin, J. Myron and Raths, James D. *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in the United States*. A Report Prepared for the Directorate for Scientific Affairs. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, February 1974.

Broudy, Harry S. *A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education*. PBTE Monograph Series #4. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May 1972.

Broudy, Harry S. *The Real World of The Public Schools*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Burke, Caseel. *The Individualized, Competency-Based System of Teacher Education at Weber State College*. PBTE Monograph Series #2. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, March 1972.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Education and The Cult of Efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

City College Program on Competency-Based Education. New York: City College of the City University of New York. January 1975.

Conant, James Bryant. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Dewey, John. *The Sources of a Science of Education*. New York: Liveright, 1929.

Dreeben, Robert. *The Nature of Teaching*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972.

Elam, Stanley. *Performance-Based Teacher Education -- What is the State of the Art?* PBTE Monograph Series #1. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971.

Elfenbein, Iris M. *Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs, A Comparative Description*. PBTE Monograph Series #8. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, October 1972.

Gallup, George H. "Sixth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 56, 1 (September 1974): 2-24.

Gentry, Cass; Dunn, Thomas; et al. "For Want of An Assessment System, CBTE Programs are Lost." PBTE 3, 3 (September 1974): 1.

Hamilton, Phyllis D. Competency-Based Teacher Education. A Report Prepared for the Office of Education. Menlo Park, California: Educational Policy Research Center, Stanford Research Institute, July 1973.

Heath, Robert W. and Nielson, Mark A. "The Research Basis for Performance-Based Teacher Education." Review of Educational Research 44, 4 (Fall 1974): 476-477.

Houston, Robert W., ed. Exploring Competency-Based Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Huff, Shiela. "Credentialing by Tests or Degrees: Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and Griggs v. Duke Power Company." Harvard Educational Review 44, 2 (May 1974): 246-247.

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

The Meaning of Teaching Competence and Competency-Based Education, for Discussion. Princeton, New Jersey: National Commission on Performance Based Education, February 1975.

New York Times, "New Graduates Seeking to Teach Are Said to Outnumber Jobs by 2 to 1," June 16, 1974.

Queens College of the City University of New York. Master of Science in Education Program. New York: February 1, 1975.

Schmieder, Allen A. Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene. PBTE Monograph Series #9. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1973.

Schmieder, Allen A. "Profile of the States in Competency-Based Education." PBTE 3, 5 (November 1974).

Skinner, B. F. The Technology of Teaching. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968.

Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1969.

Teacher Education Developmental Service. Glossary of Terms - Competency-Based Teacher Education. Albany, New York: School of Education, State University of New York at Albany, September 1974.

A Competency-Based Undergraduate Program for Preparing Elementary Teachers, N-6. New York: York College of the City University of New York, January 1975.

PBTE: VIEWPOINTS OF TWO TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS

PART TWO

by

Bernard H. McKenna
Professional Associate
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

PREFACE

This paper is not intended as a rigorous piece of social science research. One might wish the time and resources had made such possible. Rather, it is a recording of conclusions from examining the literature, impressions from visiting sites, and an interpretation of interviews, panels, workshops, and conversations with teachers and many others associated with teacher education and teaching, and more particularly with the movement called *performance-based teacher education.*

A piece of rigorous social science research might have produced different conclusions. The author's best judgment is that, had the research been done, the conclusions would not have been very different.

In the first place, there are the *Recommendations* of the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education,[1] a group that has been deeply involved in the movement over a considerable period. The positions and conclusions of this piece are at a number of points consistent with the Committee's recommendations.

Secondly, the study of the Stanford Research Institute[2] is substantially in agreement with many of the positions taken in this piece.

And then there are the observations of respected educators: Myron Atkin, Harry Broudy, Margaret Lindsey, Paul Nash, and others.

It can probably be shown that some performance-based program someplace has resolved to some degree each of the issues raised here or has found valid means to respond to the deficiencies cited. That is all to the good; such situations are foundations to build on. But a major conclusion that emerges from the critical aspects of this document is that too few such problems have been resolved and too little rigorous research and development have been brought to bear on the deficiencies for broad policy making and wide dissemination to go forward at this time.

It is not that teachers are saying stop altogether. The Introduction illustrates support of the concept. It is that we disapprove the direction and pace. Our proposals for redirection, simply stated, are: Go back to the drawing board. Pick up the research and test and try out with new vigor; and in doing so, explore a much wider range of alternatives.

It also should be understood that what is put down here is not necessarily new or unique. Little of the dialogue in this arena is. Much of it has been said in other ways and in other places, both in and outside the united teaching profession. What this paper does represent is a bringing together, documentation, and on some issues, expansion of things already said or done. It reflects what is believed to be fairly widespread concerns and positions of teachers and teacher organizations on performance-based teacher education.

B.H.M.

Introduction

At its 1974 Representative Assembly the National Education Association adopted the following new business item on performance-based teacher education:

> Resolved, that the National Education Association demand that all state education departments postpone the implementation of performance-based teacher education programs until valid and reliable research indicates that these programs are an improvement over present programs. (Item 20)

Subsequently, NEA Executive Secretary Terry Herndon, in a letter to executive secretaries of all state education associations, provided the following interpretive statements on the resolution:

> Clearly, differing situations within states related to the level of development of performance-based teacher education will require different approaches ... we support sound research and development of innovation where there is promise of improving the teaching and learning processes.... In some states where state and/or local associations have ongoing direct arrangements with CBTE experiments or programs, the NEA stands ready to provide on-site consultation service for:
>
> (1) developing or shoring up guidelines for such participation,
> (2) providing substantive input on process and content,
> (3) evaluating the experiment.
>
> These things NEA can and will do in support of meaningful and constructive change in teacher education.

Both the resolution and its interpretation stand as witness to the fact that the NEA does not oppose the concept of performance-based teacher education *per se*. As the resolution implies, what the Association objects to is premature implementation that far outruns validation of the usefulness of the innovation compared to programs which now exist or might exist if a wide variety of alternative models were researched, developed, and tried.

Indeed, the Association applauds rigorous, sophisticated efforts to identify those teaching performances which are most likely to promote the greatest learning on the part of students. All teachers recognize as a major task of the profession the promotion of learning and they are anxious to become better able to accomplish that task.

When procedures are available which provide high assurance they will promote greater learning on the part of more students, teachers will applaud them and will want to learn to perform them at the earliest possible time.

Teachers have interest, commitment, understanding, and important contributions to make on the following key substantive questions related to teacher education:

> What is it that teachers ought to know, be able to do, and feel in order to practice the profession of teaching as full-fledged professionals?
>
> Can the things to know, to do, and to feel be validated as essential knowledges, skills, and attitudes (feelings)?
>
> Are the knowledges, skills, and attitudes (once validated as essential) teachable?
>
> How shall essential knowledges, skills, and attitudes be taught and by whom?
>
> What knowledges, skills, and attitudes shall those who teach the teachers be required to possess? And how will these be validated?
>
> How will the attainment of the validated knowledges, skills, and attitudes by teachers be measured?
>
> What level of proficiency in the required knowledges, skills, and attitudes will be required for teachers to be licensed to practice the profession?
>
> How will the required levels of proficiency of knowledge, skills, and attitudes be attained by teachers already in service?

These appear to be the crucial questions that need to be addressed by all groups that become involved in what is being called performance-based teacher education.

But we believe that whether or not the problems reflected in these questions will be worked on and resolved in positive and constructive ways that improve the teaching profession depends in great measure on what groups will be involved in their resolution, in what manner, and in what proportions. So in this monograph, issues on who should be involved and by what processes are dealt with first. Substantive concerns related to the important questions above are dealt with mainly in Sections III and IV.

Section I

NEGOTIABLE INTERESTS OF TEACHERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Negotiation in its collective bargaining, proposal-counterproposal sense is a process for decision making which provides both parties equity in influencing the decisions. It is a vehicle by which the parties come to understand each other's points of view and interests, reduce differences, and place in written contractual terms those items on which they reach agreement. It has come to be an important decision-making mechanism in thousands of school districts across the nation where 1.4 million teachers work.

There are a number of teacher education issues, both pre-service and in-service, which clearly involve the working conditions and curriculum and instruction arenas and which teachers will want to negotiate into master agreements with their boards of education. Negotiable issues for pre-service instruction arenas, which teachers will want to negotiate into master agreements with their boards of education, will be delineated in this section. Teachers' negotiable interests in in-service education are discussed in the NEA publication, Organizational Aspects of Inservice Education[3].

Other issues are related to college and university and state agency* as well as teachers' interests in and responsibilities for teacher education and will require three- or four-party deliberation and resolution: teacher association, school district, college or university, state agency. Some such issues may need to be resolved by adaptations of the conventional bargaining model where proposal-counterproposal does not lend itself well to three- or four- party decision making.

One such operational arrangement is the Washington state model. There, tripartite consortia -- teacher association, school district, and college or university -- operate on a regional basis. Dolores McDaniels, a teacher in Spokane and chairperson of the Washington Education Association Commission on Certification and Accreditation, says of this arrangement:

> I, as a classroom teacher, now have a right to develop better programs for teacher training.... I feel they are better because of our (teacher) expertise in what's needed to practice in the "real world."[4]

---

*State agencies may be state boards of education, state departments of education, or, increasingly, standards and licensure commissions, depending on how particular states delegate the governance of such matters.

If Teacher Education Becomes a More Fully Cooperative Activity

Negotiation interests of teachers will continue to be important, no matter what the degree of achievement of full cooperation in the teacher education enterprise. The degree of involvement and the number of teachers to be involved in the "cooperatives" are themselves negotiable items. Norma Kacen, executive director of the Houston, Texas, Teachers Association, put it this way:

> In the area of governance, PBTE is rapidly becoming a provocateur in awakening teachers to their role as decision makers in teacher education and staff development and motivating teachers to act.[5]

Consortium governance has become a popular term in the performance-based movement for referring to proposals for teacher education cooperatives. On the consortium principle, we subscribe to the concept that all those who will be affected by decisions should be involved in their determination and that those who will be affected most should have the highest involvement and the largest representation in the determination.

In consortium-governance arrangements, the matter of representation will remain paramount, the dissatisfaction with playing the numbers game notwithstanding. Kirst raises the issue in the context of the question, "But what is representative?"[6] After putting forth some theoretical discussion of representation, he suggests that there might be two different representational groups for different issues: one relating to what he calls "technical and measurable," the other to "value-laden" components.

This proposal does not appear recommendable from at least two standpoints. First, those groups included in the political ("value-laden") governance mechanism (teacher organizations most probably would be in this group) have a large measure of professional and technical expertise to contribute to decision making on the full range of issues in this arena: research, development, field testing, evaluation, and dissemination. One serious problem with past research and development efforts on PBTE particularly, and teaching generally, has been the lack of involvement of practitioners, particularly teachers.

Second, the political and substantive in educational matters are so inextricably interwoven that to attempt to separate them for decision-making purposes would likely do damage to both and would result in inordinate expenditure of time and effort in making the two mesh, once independent policies had been established. Single bodies seem more recommendable for both purposes, bodies in which representation is based on referent constituencies, i.e., teachers' associations, school districts, colleges and universities, students, and state agencies. Representatives to such bodies would be accountable to their constituents. This does not exclude the possible need for separate committees within the various organizations to deal internally with their own needs, concerns, and positions--getting it all together, so to speak--before interacting with the consortium.

As Kirst states in identifying various definitions of representation, "the proportion of classroom teachers or any group would be chosen to produce an accurate map or mirror of the entire educational community."[7] Since teachers make up the largest portion of professional practitioners, they would have the largest proportion of members on policy-setting bodies for PBTE.

If Teacher Education Becomes a More Fully Field-Based Activity

The preceding assumptions have to do mainly with structures and process: who shall be involved, through what mechanisms, and in what proportions.

This section addresses the topic of arenas of involvement and the degree of involvement in each. It speaks to a premise common in most, if not all, PBTE proposals: *that teacher education should and will become more field-based.* But it speaks to a broader context than field-basedness.

The Context of Field-Basedness is Broad

As it is related to teachers, a key question in this context is, "Field-basedness to what ends?" Because the field is where teachers reside and where professional decisions and actions of almost all sorts impinge on their abilities to exercise their highest levels of professional expertise and judgment.

Assuming that simply placing more of the teacher education experience "in the field" will correct numerous present deficiencies is extreme oversimplification. While higher quality, better supervised experiences in the schools in direct relation to children are absolutely essential for teacher candidates, it certainly seems unwise to move larger and larger proportions of the total preparation program from university to field without sufficient rationale. Several important considerations prompt this point of view.

One consideration is related to the growing theoretical base of professional studies for teaching and the appropriate arena for its pursual.* Are not the classrooms and laboratories of the colleges and universities at least as appropriate settings as the public schools for such learning activities?

For several purposes in the theoretical and laboratory phases, the university setting would appear to be considerably more advantageous. Large support has developed in recent years for an interdisciplinary approach to the foundations of education -- psychology, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, psycholinguistics, and the like. If these disciplines are to be meaningfully interrelated as they apply to the practice of teaching, learning activities will be required that are collaboratively developed between educationists and university faculties in the arts and sciences. There is probably little advantage in attempting to work out such complex relationships in the setting of elementary and secondary schools. In addition, emerging laboratory experiences which depend on videotaping, self-administered learning kits, simulation, role playing, and a variety of other devices are probably better accomplished in special facilities and with technical staff support that are more accessible on the college campus. The fact that the real-experience components of preparation in law and medicine have been intensified and extended has not resulted in recommendations from those professions of the kind made by Andrews[8] that schools of education be closed altogether.

---

*Appropriate consideration of and settings for such studies are considered later on in this section.

Some other circumstances in the schools themselves warrant serious consideration. In many places the schools have found it difficult, if not impossible, to support adequately conventional student teaching programs. Reports are legion of student teachers being almost abandoned to sink or swim with full professional responsibilities, being overburdened with baby-sitting chores or being confined to "advanced observation." In addition, the fact that supervising teachers lack time to work directly with student teachers and to participate in in-service opportunities to learn better ways of supervision is well documented. Reports from at least one major performance-based project are that assignment, involvement, and supervisory arrangements for the field-based experience are not better than what has been deplored for so long about the conventional student teaching arrangements.

Among the problems reported by teachers are:

- Rigid procedures for assignment of interns or procedures almost totally without criteria
- Little or no opportunity for cooperating teachers to become involved in the assignment process
- Little or no opportunity for students to become involved in the assignment process
- Inappropriate criteria (or none) for designation of cooperating teachers
- Lack of time provisions for cooperating teachers to work directly with interns and with personnel from the university
- Supervisory loads of several student teachers, increasing the pressure on the supervising teacher and making close supervision next to impossible.

Then there is the problem of commitment and capability of many local school districts to conduct the complicated and sensitive tasks related to the preparation of those who will eventually enter the profession as full-fledged practitioners. There appears to be low selectivity in this dimension.

Not all hospitals are teaching hospitals. Not all social agencies are approved for interning social workers. Nor should all schools receive teaching interns. There should be minimal criteria for such schools and rigorous periodic evaluation of their continued capability to perform the functions indicated by the criteria. In a condensed version of what was termed an extensive sociological investigation of the Teacher Corps, it is concluded that "schools with teacher education responsibilities should be inspected and selected on the basis of mutually accepted criteria for teacher education."[9]

Most school districts allocate meager or no funding, personnel, and material to in-service education or to pre-service education. With present financial conditions in most school districts what they are, the necessary augmented resources for these purposes are not likely to be forthcoming from local school budgets.

These deficiencies and others not cited, it could be argued, are no fault of the performance-based concept. It has been said that they are inherent in any model for teacher education. But a movement that emphasizes field-basedness as one of its strong assets might be expected to have developed a very careful plan for the nature and management of field experience prior to its implementation. Otherwise, the mistakes of the past will be repeated. That seems to be pretty much the case in some PBTE situations. In one prominent program, college personnel boast that they never select school districts for PBTE involvement--the districts select *them*.

There was a time when so many teachers were in preparation that schools of education needed to take advantage of every possible placement situation for student teachers with little opportunity to apply any criteria.

All that is changing. There is now unique opportunity to select school districts and schools with great care, to develop high standards for their participation in the field-based components, and to hold them to those standards.

Specific Areas for Negotiation

Assuming that issues related to consortium governance can be resolved, that the appropriate balance of field-based activities and other preparation components are agreed on, and that other problems cited above related to implementing the field-based approach can be worked out, what will be the negotiable interests of teachers' associations in these activities?

Teachers' negotiable interests will continue to be broad and deep. Teachers will need to have the opportunity, if they wish to exercise it,* to negotiate policy for determining procedures and, as appropriate, to become directly involved in those procedures on the following range of issues that affect field-based programs:

1. Defining, planning, and conducting the total field experience
2. Defining roles of local supervising teachers
3. Defining roles of local field experience administrators
4. Defining roles of cooperating university personnel
5. Selection of local supervising teachers
6. Selection of local field-experience administrators
7. Selection of cooperating university personnel
8. Preparation (continuous in-service) of local supervising teachers
9. Preparation of local field-experience administrators
10. Preparation of cooperating university personnel
11. Assignment of supervising teachers to teacher education activities
12. Intern load and time for both local and university personnel for conducting the field experience
13. Selection of interns
14. Assignment of interns, including determination of their suitability for specific assignments and assurance of nondiscrimination
15. Evaluation, reassignment, and termination of interns
16. Financial arrangements, including remuneration and other benefits of cooperating teachers
17. Provision of support services, media, and materials to serve the total teacher education involvement at the local level
18. Policies and practice related to teacher aides, individually guided education programs, and implementation of the career ladder concept.

The above list is probably not all-inclusive. In some states and some local situations where close attention has been given to field-based teacher education activities over a long period or where some of the more recent, more fully cooperative programs have been operational for some time, there doubtless are other aspects of field-based programs for which negotiation and inclusion in master agreements is desirable. As teachers read these pages they will note our omissions and, we hope, call them to our attention.

---

*In differing state and local situations differing approaches have and are being taken by associations in dealing with these issues.

Some Other Issues Related to Cooperation and Field-Basedness as They Affect Negotiation

Some basic philosophical and theoretical issues related to the professional nature of teaching, the substance of teacher education, and the identification of responsibilities merit separate consideration as they relate to teachers' associations negotiable interests. Teachers will want to negotiate full involvement in the determination of a broad range of substantive issues related to teacher education, including subject matter content and criteria for selecting, validating, and teaching appropriate performances to both prospective and in-service teachers. So involvement in the resolution of all the issues discussed in the remainder of this section should be considered negotiable items if teachers' associations choose to deal with them in that manner.

Emphasis on Major Components

There are several common and essential components for preparation to practice most professions:

1. Depth of knowledge and understanding of the discipline or disciplines on which the profession is based
2. Professional theory based on knowledge, research, and empirical evidence
3. Laboratory-type experiences in practicing the profession
4. Internship-type experiences in practicing the profession.

Such experiences may be sequential or concurrent or both. Whatever the ordering, professions other than teaching appear to have better recognized the significance of these components and to have achieved a balance among them. This seems clear in such professions as law, dentistry and medicine, even though they are currently reassessing appropriateness of content, emphasis, and time frames for their various preparation programs.

Subject Matter Knowledge and Professional Studies

Assuming that the knowledge base in a discipline or disciplines appropriate to particular teaching fields is achieved through in-depth pursuits in the college of arts and sciences, then the division among the other components cited becomes mainly a function of those who make decisions on appropriate professional study for licensure in the teaching profession. This is not to say that questions of how much and what kind of mathematics an early elementary teacher should study or how much European history should be required for becoming a secondary social studies teacher are unimportant. It is only that these questions need to be worked out in arenas somewhat different from the three- or four-party consortium already discussed. They are appropriate issues for resolution by subject matter scholars in the various teaching fields, practitioners (particularly teachers), and professors of the pedagogy of those particular subjects. It would seem logical to bring together methods instructors for the various disciplines and their counterparts in the subject matter organizations of the various teaching fields, i.e., councils of teachers of English, mathematics, social studies, and the like. But this is probably not sufficient input for determining the appropriate nature of the content, how, and by what methods. Not only are those who speak for the subject matter groups (their leadership) frequently dominated by supervisory and administrative personnel and higher education types, but their general memberships often contain a minority of teachers. Since teachers have much to contribute to determining the nature and content of the disciplines for teacher education as well as what instructional methods should be applied to the different disciplines, decision-making bodies on these issues should certainly include substantial representation of teachers.

The performance-based movement appears to slight this important consideration. Even though there may be exceptions in a few programs, teaching the basic skill areas does not seem to have been given much attention. For example, in its efforts to help teachers perfect the asking of higher order questions or to write behavioral objectives, the movement generally seems to neglect such matters as the quantity and type of mathematics instruction needed by those preparing for early elementary teaching and what methodologies in the teaching of mathematics they should internalize.

In California, where the entire professional course sequence is limited to 12 units, teachers in preparation have highly restricted opportunity to learn much of the technology of teaching any single subject, not to mention the several subject areas which are commonly the responsibility of elementary teachers.

So teacher expert judgment needs to be brought to bear on these issues also. And through the process of negotiation, through regional consortia (as in the state of Washington), or through state-level governance mechanisms, teachers will need to lend their expertise to ensure that appropriate balance and emphasis are achieved between the academic disciplines and professional studies.

Emphasis within the Professional Studies

Within the professional studies, major issues have to do with the relative emphasis on theoretical pursuits as compared to laboratory and to intership activities.

There is emphasis in the performance-based movement on laboratory activities related to teaching skills and on field-based internships or student teaching experiences. The field-based components appear to further emphasize the skills activities.

Considering that teachers have directed complaints about their school of education coursework to courses in both theory and methodology, it might appear that they would welcome a heavy emphasis on skills in either a laboratory or an internship setting. Teachers realize, however, that there is emerging a substantial body of theory about teaching that is useful and necessary if they are to practice at a high level of professional expertise and judgment. The ability to exercise a high level of professional judgment is partially the result of understanding why things do or do not happen, their origins in concept and theory. Dan Griffiths, a prominent teacher educator, has addressed the issue this way:

> A profession rests upon theoretical bases.... Clearly, research in the past ten years indicates that, given sufficient support, a knowledge base can be established which will give full professional standing to teaching.[10]

Griffiths provides a warning in the same piece:

> Ignoring the lessons of history and proceeding without adequate theoretical foundations, the competency-based teacher education movement is the latest example of an anti-intellectual tradition that prevents teaching from becoming fully professional.[11]

Such fields as child growth and development, learning psychology, and the sociology of the school have developed substantial and useful bodies of knowledge in recent years, knowledge and precepts that provide a basis for understanding children, learning, and the institution called school. Sadly, traditional programs in many schools of education have not pursued these important subjects in much breadth or depth.

Performance-based programs do not seem to be attending well to these theoretical disciplines either. Lindsey admonishes:

> Whatever approach or combination of approaches is employed by arriving at competencies to serve as the basis for planning a CBTE program, a critical question needs to be asked: What knowledge or body of concepts is essential in making the decisions required in the exercise of the competence? Considerably more attention needs to be given to those disciplines which help in understanding and interpreting individual and group behavior

> -- which contribute principles and methods fundamental to rational decision making in teaching. Failure to draw upon bodies of knowledge and methods in such disciplines as sociology, anthropology, psychology, and philosophy when identifying competencies may result in lists of behaviors limited to the craftsmanship of teaching rather than the full range of competencies expected of the professional teacher.[12]

Unique Conditions Which Will Affect Roles

Roles of teachers, supervisors, administrators, and college personnel in teacher education and appropriate arenas and processes for their determination have been dealt with throughout this section. Special note needs to be taken of some conditions that affect these roles and their interrelationships.

The roles will obviously be affected by the kind of organization present in the schools. Roles in self-contained classroom settings will be different from those in team-teaching and open-classroom arrangements.

Roles will also be different where the principal is regarded as a master teacher as compared to where he is regarded as a community relations expert, general manager, and coordinator of personnel and resources.

The roles will be different where strong central office curriculum councils assume leadership for curriculum decisions as compared to where emphasis is on building-level decision making by teams of teachers.

Finally, the roles will vary with the goals and objectives established for schooling in the community.

All the various implications of these differences for role determination are beyond the scope of this monograph. They must be dealt with in terms of local needs, interests, and commitments. The resolution of these complex issues must be placed in the context of the united teaching profession's commitment to a high degree of local self-determination, with teachers always playing major roles in that self-determination.

* * * * * * * *

The performance-based movement may have the opportunity to help increase the knowledge base for teaching, to further develop already existing knowledge bases, to test and try out and, once validated, disseminate those things that prove reasonably certain and to identify new roles as well as clarify existing ones. But as yet it seems not to have seized well on these opportunities.

Teachers' negotiable interests in teacher education include assurance that if the movement goes forward these opportunities will be maximized.

Section II

TEACHERS' GENERAL PROFESSIONAL STAKE IN TEACHER EDUCATION: WHY TEACHERS WANT AND REQUIRE MAJOR VOICE IN THE ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED IN THE FIRST SECTION

Almost all teachers are proud of their profession. Most believe, whether or not they verbalize it that way, that no social service save health is more important to society than education of the young. This is evidenced by teachers' increased interest in recent years in influencing what the schools of education teach, how teachers are licensed and inducted into the profession, and how in-service education is conducted; and their interest in influencing political decisions and policy making at state and national levels on the priorities for education.

Teachers do not support only those actions and policies that promote their own welfare. Through the NEA and its affiliates, their interests in the broader issues are well documented over a long period and have resulted, for example, in: large contributions to school desegregation, efforts on behalf of student rights, support of programs for the disadvantaged, attention to morality in government, efforts to combat sexism, program support for bilingual/multicultural education, and a current major effort at calling attention to areas of educational neglect.

The purpose in this section is to show that the negotiable interests of teachers in teacher education listed in Section I have a broad and deep base. Teachers have long had intense and abiding interests in their professional preparation. The advent of negotiation as a major decision-making process in education has brought about a new and more viable process for teachers to implement those commitments described below which are of long standing.

On Generally Improving and Stabilizing the Profession

Almost 30 years ago the NEA brought into being the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS). Since then it has been in the forefront of efforts to improve the profession. Historically the NEA, through its TEPS Commission, was more responsible than any other group for the following improvements:

1. Requirement of the baccalaureate degree as minimum preparation for all teachers

2. Expansion of student teaching experiences

3. Expansion of the knowledge base for teaching.

The TEPS Commission recently was phased into the NEA Council on Instruction and Professional Development (IPD), which continues to contribute in a large way to new knowledge through programs aimed at excellence in professional preparation. Current work of the Council includes:

1. Determining appropriate roles for practitioner involvement in teacher education
2. Resolving issues related to the use of paraprofessionals in the schools
3. Developing a frame of reference on standards for the teaching profession.

The NEA Task Force on Practitioner Involvement in Teacher Education looked into such areas as initial preparation, advanced preparation, governance of teacher education, and legislation and research as they bear on the teacher preparation function and teachers' relation to it.[13] In its recommendations, the Task Force concluded that teacher education is a responsibility of the total teaching profession and urged the NEA, through the IPD Council and program area, to continue and to extend its activities in the teacher education area.

The NEA has also been a long-time sponsor of Student NEA and Future Teachers of America (FTA). The former organization has over the years consisted of upwards of 100,000 college students in preparation for the teaching profession. FTA was for high school students with an interest in teaching as a career. A purpose of these groups has been to increase the probability that persons of high potential ability and a strong interest in and commitment to working with children and youth elect to prepare for teaching. The Association itself has been a strong proponent of self-selection being an important part of the process of determining who shall prepare to teach.

Additionally, NEA has sponsored over the years numerous conferences and workshops on the improvement of professional preparation and has produced a wide variety of publications on topics ranging from subject matter knowledge to student teaching.

Why do teachers continue to be willing to allocate resources and staff to broad issues related to teacher education? There are at least two major reasons.

First, teachers want the profession improved and stabilized. As one teacher leader in New England put it, "Public school teaching has become a very sophisticated, time-consuming, thought-provoking profession, and it seems to me that prospective teachers should have real introduction to this complex world."[14]

Secondly, teachers already in service are concerned about the kinds of persons who will be selected to prepare for teaching, the kind of preparation they will receive, and how they will be licensed, selected, and inducted because they want assurance that their new colleagues will be of the highest calibre. They want to see their profession thrive and become stronger.

The NEA has recognized and worked on the problems of transiency in the profession. Its major efforts to increase general revenue for education and to make possible salaries more commensurate with other professions have been to this end. Increased revenues and higher salaries discourage teachers from moving out of the classroom. The Association has also labored at improving working conditions, particularly teacher load, class size, preparation time, and availability of materials and media, all of which encourage teachers to stay in the profession. Recent programs of the Association to promote teacher-centered in-service education represent another effort in this direction. Almost universally teachers complain of the lack of opportunity to strengthen themselves professionally.

The NEA has also been influential in making it possible for women teachers to raise families without having to drop out of the profession--through maternity leaves, day-care centers, and the like.

Another important illustration of teachers' serious concern about teacher preparation is involvement in the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Mainly through efforts of the NEA, eight of the Council's nineteen members are now NEA-appointed teachers. The current Council is chaired by a teacher, and its committee of five on standards includes two NEA appointees. In addition, increasing numbers of teachers serve on teams that visit schools of education for accreditation purposes. In 1973-74, 39.1% of the visiting team members were practitioners, an increase from 12.1 in the fall of 1971. Again, this improvement can be attributed directly to NEA efforts.

On Determining Standards and Licensure: Governance by Consortia at the State Level

Another major rationale for teachers becoming fully involved in all aspects of change for improving teacher education as recommended in the first section is that they have a unique stake in and expertise on matters that should determine standards for the profession. At least as important as the consortia of school systems, colleges and universities, and state agencies for implementing programs of teacher education are state-level consortia for determining policy on accreditation of institutions and programs, licensing procedures, and study and research on teacher education.

The NEA has led in the development of theory and practice related to such consortia. Generally, these state-level agencies are referred to as standards and practices boards or commissions but go under varying names. (California, for example, has a Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.) Their purpose is to provide self-governance for the teaching profession in matters which require a high level of professional expertise.

The teaching profession is almost unique in that lay boards (state boards of education) in most states govern professional matters as well as control education.* In most other professions, professional matters are regulated at the state level by bodies made up totally or mainly of practitioners--state boards of nursing, accounting, medicine, and law, for example.

The professional matters referred to here include accreditation of teacher preparation institutions; policy on goals and content for teacher education programs; policy on requirements and mechanisms for licensure; policy on professional practice; and identifying, coordinating, and conducting needed study and research on teacher education. These matters are of high concern to teachers because the arenas in which they are educated and in which they practice have the profoundest effects on their total careers. Their intense involvement in these arenas make them particularly qualified to play major roles in the important professional decision making required to govern both preparation and practice. Besides, it is axiomatic that in social agencies those to be most affected by decisions should play major roles in decision making.

One way in which the work of these state-level consortia can relate directly to the performance-based movement is illustrated in an activity of the California Commission. Through a grant from the National Institute of Education, the California Commission is coordinating a research and development project to identify teaching performances which contribute to student learning in reading and arithmetic. This seems to be an appropriate role for such agencies.

But significant as the California study is in both setting precedent for the identification of requisite teaching performances and making a substantive contribution to new knowledge, important cautions must be taken.

All those who become involved in such research have a serious responsibility to report or speak out in ways that will not mislead the profession and the public into believing that the results of a single study or any group of studies are adequate for establishing policy and for broad dissemination. If there are ever to be discovered performances that without fail (or nearly so) cause student learning, it will not likely be done on the basis of any one study or group of studies carried out over a few years. It will more likely be on the basis of a great variety of longitudinal studies conducted with appropriate resources, personnel, and time. Determining what teacher performances result directly in what student learning outcomes might be likened to what it took to get to the moon--more than 10 years of intensive effort (with considerable planning and groundwork before that), nearly unlimited resources, and almost total autonomy.

The role of the California Commission described above is not unlike one of those set down for the recently constituted National Commission on

---

*The control of education has to do with what the goals of the schools shall be, how they shall be financed, and how they shall be organized.

Performance-Based Education. The Commission lists among its research and development goals:

> To develop and test hypotheses about relations between teaching performances and children's learning.[15]

We support such a purpose. We also look with interest on the proposed function of the Commission to "provide policy guidelines for research priorities on teaching competence."[16] In this respect, we view the Commission's work as important in ensuring that such research policy provides time, talent, and other resources to bring about numbers of studies of alternative types and under varying conditions. And above all, we hope the Commission will consider all findings of such studies tentative over a long period and that they will use all the pursuasive powers they possess to ensure that policy making and broad-range decision making based on the findings are not prematurely undertaken.

Section III

THE NEED FOR ALTERNATIVE MODELS

The history of teacher education has not been marked by large ferment, rapid strides, or high priority periods in terms of either prestige or allocation of resources. So it was not unexpected that, with the advent of pump priming by the federal government, schools of education responded in ways that promised the highest possibility for sharing in the resources. They cannot be faulted much for that. But the federal allocating agency *can* be faulted for so narrowing the guidelines for participation.

Some Limitations on Alternatives

The U.S. Office of Education, in initial promotion of the PBTE movement, appeared to pursue a policy which implied that only one form of professional education for teachers was viable, that somehow it (the agency) was certain of this, and that if all professional preparation programs for teachers moved in a particular direction, everything would be all right.*

Early pronouncements from the federal agency and attendant guidelines for funding reflected as highly desirable for viable (read fundable) teacher education programs such characteristics as the following:

- Systems oriented
- Modularized
- Technological
- Multimedia
- Field-based
- Performance-based
- Individualized.

Assuming that these characteristics *per se* will result in better prepared teachers and more learning for students is very thin reasoning. These characteristics in and of themselves are not objectionable although some are highly questionable for the purpose of teacher education. However, they appear not to respond well to some of the basic substantive needs dealt with in Section II.

---

*Even the language applied to the titles selected for studies done through USOE funding indicated a strong evangelism; for example, The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education.

Some Questionable Essentials

Inclusion of the systems approach as an important component likely originated from the high regard in which systems analysis has been held in the private sector and in federal agencies in recent years. Efficiency models are also not new to education. Callahan reports an early and lengthy history of such efforts.[17] But some important questions seem to have gone unanswered, or at least not to have been investigated in very much depth, in pronouncing that a systems approach should be an important element in the PBTE movement.

One question that might have been more thoroughly examined is how well systems approaches have worked in their original settings. The answers appear far from conclusive. They seem to have worked better in the private sector, e.g., Ford Motor Company, than in the public. Numbers of studies and articles recently have called to attention the poor results with MBO and PPBES in federal bureaucracies[18] characterized by their heavy emphasis on systems, cost-effectiveness, and performance evaluation dimensions. However, in the private sector, cost-effectiveness PPBES systems have not even kept some institutions financially solvent let alone moral and responsible in serving the public.

President Harold Enarson of The Ohio State University has reminded us of Peter Drucker's point that it is our job "to find the right thing to do, not to find the right way to do things." Enarson goes on to say that "corporate management won't help us define the ends of education. Cost-benefit analysis cannot decide who pays for educational opportunity--that's a question of public policy, of social justice."[19]

William H. Drummond has stated the position well:

> A good human system does not have to have a completely clear view of the end product. A good system recognizes that man's knowledge is limited; that teaching is situation specific...There is danger that a system may become closed--that is, it may become unable to change as conditions external to the system change.[20]

Nor does emphasis on modules appear to be based on evidence that such packaging holds high promise for improvement. The AACTE Committee on PBTE recently acknowledged that "the use of modules is not a necessary, defining characteristic of PBTE programs."[21] And Hersh points out that "one extension of this process (retaining a skill based thrust) is that the modules developed become seen as being sufficient unto themselves rather than as clear parts of a fully integrated larger experience."[22] Some of the most prominent current PBTE experiments are highly modular.

The Committee also indicates it can be implied that an essential characteristic of PBTE is that the instructional program is not time-based in units of fixed duration. Yet modules *are* units, and they tend to be developed in ways that at least assume time frames for their completion.

Some Possible Alternatives

In proposing "realignments for teacher education,"[23] Wilhelms presents a model for improving preparation, one in which all the essential elements seem to be taken into account, in which sequencing and concurrency seem reasonable, and which appears to reflect a balance among theory, skills, development, and practice in the schools.

A number of the essential characteristics in Wilhelm's model are not inconsistent with parts of some performance-based proposals and implementations. Some are at considerable variance. Others reflect more differences in degree of emphasis and priority. Wilhelms gives high priority to the personal development of the teacher candidate. He states that (along with Arthur Coombs) he believes the effective teacher to be a mature person who has learned to use himself effectively as a teaching instrument, that teaching is a personal act--"basically intercommunicative and interrelative with other persons." This seems to be in contrast to some PBTE programs that place heavy emphasis on cognitive skills, on self-taught, modular instruction in which the student completes the kit (mainly on his own), submits to the evaluation device, then proceeds to the next module. Students in some PBTE programs have expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of opportunity to interrelate more directly and more frequently with staff and each other as they go through the program.

The general design of the Wilhelms model calls for (1) a curriculum of field experiences, (2) a continuing seminar, and (3) an instructional laboratory. To some this may appear to be teacher education of several decades ago revisited, particularly the continuing seminar which calls for an interdisciplinary-team approach to instruction. Unquestionably, some of those early experiments with core curriculum in teacher education did not work very well. However, considerable knowledge concerning teacher education has been acquired in the meantime. Perhaps it is time to try it again with some new adaptations. The same mistakes do not have to be repeated. It is just possible that it is an idea whose time has come. As noted earlier, there is today much more substance in child growth and development, learning psychology, sociology of the schools, cultural anthropology, philosophy, and other disciplines and emerging disciplines, all with important relevance to teaching.

Wilhelms recommends some other interventions that were not characteristic of earlier efforts, for example, the same students and the same faculty team working more intensively with students in the field. While the field-based characteristic of PBTE might be expected to satisfy this provision, we have been unable to find much emphasis on either interdisciplinary approaches or school of education faculty teams working in the field. In fact, teachers involved in at least one prominent PBTE program indicate that the field supervision aspects of PBTE may be one of its weakest links. There have been reports of infrequent visits of college personnel to the school setting and little effort to relate the theoretical education content and that of related disciplines to the field experience in ways that would result in its being meaningful--an experience that would help teachers-in-preparation see the wholeness of the practice of the profession and be able to answer the question of why they do what they do. The problem of reflecting this wholeness in PBTE programs has been well dealt with by Broudy.[24]

A third major component of the Wilhelm's model that is reflected in some PBTE programs is what he terms an *instructional laboratory*--" a place richly equipped and manned by a variety of specialists." The University of Houston installation and some of what takes place at Florida's International University seem to fit this category.

Another promising alternative appears to be in the form of the University of Florida's Childhood Education Program. Coombs and Kinzer describe it as a program "designed to facilitate the student's development as an effective person-teacher."[25] Some unique aspects of this program which are worth pursuing and which seem not to have had much impact in the performance-based movement include:

1. Program emphasis on personal meaning rather than on behavior
2. Program characterized by an open system of thinking--one in which it is not required that all outcomes be precisely defined in advance
3. Attention to the "fit" of the teaching method to the particular teacher and the particular situation in which the teacher is working
4. An ongoing seminar for the purpose of tying everything together
5. Emphasis on self-evaluation and on students' helping each other identify and explore teaching problems.

Another source of alternatives is in the Canadian experience. At the University of British Columbia, the Faculty of Education has developed for test and tryout nine alternative teacher education programs. Although considerably oriented to internship experience in the schools and to community study and involvement, only two of the models appear to reflect PBTE premises in any substantial way. If one Canadian institution can generate such a range of alternative models, there must be endless possibilities in American institutions with their great variety were they to think expansively and veer from what is fast becoming single-mindedness.

A whole galaxy of possible alternatives present themselves from examination of the work of Joyce and Weil. Sixteen different models categorized in four "families" are identified in Models of Teaching.[26]

As Weil states in another publication, "many competency-based program designs begin the delineation of competencies at the micro-level and continue to build a program of small behavioral outcomes...Columbia University Teachers College...began with the teaching strategy as the basic unit of the program design."[27]

Whether or not generation of the model from a teaching strategy as a basic element is the more recommendable procedure is debatable. In another place, Joyce, Soltis, and Weil name five strategies (options) for identifying models of teaching.[28] Some of these, it might be argued, hold as much promise as that employing the teaching strategy as the basic element.*

Whatever the strategy for identifying the model, whatever the model or models selected, and based on whatever values, the Joyce-Weil materials should be a rich resource. Only recently does the PBTE movement seem to have drawn on these models, then only minimally and in a few places.

Finally, a source for identification of performances to be further tested and tried which came out in the work of Rosenshine and Furst[29] and which once was strongly advocated now seems to be less hopeful. Rosenshine and Furst selected a set of studies (50 of them) that identified teacher performances which appeared the most promising for producing student achievement -- performances such as clarity, variability, and enthusiasm. But a recent reanalysis of Rosenshine-Furst by Heath and Nielson[30] raises serious questions about the consistency of definition of performance, the adequacy of the achievement measures, and the statistical tests applied in identifying the promising performances. Even so, some of the performances that appear to hold up the best under the Heath-Nielson scrutiny may still be better places to put effort than where some of it seems to be going currently.

In his review of the research on teacher behavior and student achievement, Potter identifies some measures (from the Rosenshine-Furst review and others) which he describes as "clearly worthy of further study."[31] At the same time he indicates support for the Rosenshine statement "that we know very little about the relationship between classroom behavior and student gains." Then he provides some recommendations, several of which bear repeating in the context of this discussion:

- Research designs should accommodate all of the variables which affect student achievement. Neither teacher behavior nor student achievement occurs in a vacuum; instead they occur in a complex interaction with other variables, such as organizational climate, teacher and student characteristics, and student peer group behavior....

---

*One of these, "the particular educational approach," seems to be persuasive in its logic. A curriculum is first developed along with its particular materials. Then the tasks are specified which will be required to implement the curriculum. Following that, teacher roles are defined for accomplishing the tasks.

- The range of student achievement measures should be expanded to include all levels and types of student gain that are desired by the educational system....

- Teacher behavior measures should focus not only on teacher behavior toward the class as a whole, but also on teacher behavior relative to individual students.

Because so little in teacher education is verifiable, wouldn't it be neat if the USOE, the various consortia, the individual institutional projects, and the AACTE were to place some resources, energies, and talents in researching several alternative models under carefully controlled situations and using control groups based on already existent programs?

And wouldn't it be neat if the same groups were to support a number of tightly designed research projects to further test the effects on student learning of one or more of the performances "worthy of further study"--tentative as they are--identified by Rosenshine and Furst and by Potter?

Such approaches seem to make a lot of sense. They make a lot more sense, in fact, than beginning with unvalidated models from the private sector, delineated, as Weil[32] says, at the micro-level and built into small behavioral outcomes that have not been shown related to much of anything.

Section IV

SPECIFIC ISSUES IN PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION OF CONCERN TO TEACHERS

At this point it seems appropriate to deal with the issue of *definition* of performance-based teacher education. Too many treatises on the subject -- and on a variety of other educational innovations, for that matter -- succeed in presenting long and persuasive arguments without defining what is being discussed. It is a safe way to proceed. When one's position is opposed, he or she can always plead that that is not, by definition, what was meant.

The following definition, if widely accepted, might alleviate some of the problems with the movement:

> Performance-based teacher education is a procedure for helping prospective and in-service teachers acquire those knowledges, skills, and attitudes that research, empirical evidence, and expertise indicate contribute most to providing learning opportunities that are consistent with objectives of schools.*

The above definition is in contrast to one which appears to have, in large measure, guided the PBTE movement:

> ...in performance-based programs performance goals are specified, and agreed to, in rigorous detail in advance of instruction. The student must either be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it.... Emphasis is on demonstrated product or output.[33]

At first examination, the difference between the two definitions might seem to be mainly in degree. It is more than that -- it is a major philosophical difference running through not only the PBTE movement but also through the broader movement known as accountability. And this brings us to a major implication of PBTE which disturbs teachers.

Relating Performance to Outcomes

It has been said that one mark of a charlatan in any profession is that he guarantees outcomes.[34] The proprietor of the diploma mill guarantees that the recipient of his sheepskin will get a job; the mail order house guarantees the would-be horticulturist that great oaks will grow from acorns

---

*This definition is one that has been widely used in the united teaching profession. It implies that *teacher* expertise should carry heavy weight in such determination.

if only the customer buys the wonder fertilizer and applies it as directed; the medical quack guarantees that his electronic machine will cause warts to disappear or correct stomach ailments -- whatever the need.

The well-prepared and seasoned professional has learned better. Such learning is part of becoming a senior professional. If he is a lawyer, he has learned the most current and acceptable procedures for preparing briefs and arguing cases, but he has also learned that even the best of these will not always result in winning cases. If he is an accountant, he has learned the most accurate and efficient manner for rendering balances and measuring the financial status of the business, but he cannot assure that balance sheets will show particular outcomes (read profits). If he is a physician, he has learned the most sophisticated techniques for diagnosing and prescribing, but he cannot assure recovery and continued good health.

A wide range of observers have warned against the posture expressed in the Elam definition that "the student either must be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning or exhibit behaviors known to promote it...." Three are cited here.

Robert Stake, prominent researcher and evaluation specialist, says:

> School personnel do not -- nor does anyone else -- know how to make specific massive improvement in student performance. It will not help to specify what all students should know, or feel, or be able to do. In fact it will hurt. The improvement most people yearn for will only come when opportunities come, in school and out. The schools need to be encouraged to examine the quality of learning opportunities they provide.[35]

The last sentence of the Stake statement is highly consistent with the definition of PBTE suggested above by the author as acceptable.

John Brademas, Congressman from Indiana, puts it another way:

> ...when the parent goes to the teacher to say: "You're being paid to teach, but my Johnny can't read," the teacher will be able to point out that certain factors beyond her control, but perhaps within the parents' control, may well be standing in Johnny's way.... The only way I can agree, in a moral sense, to make some attempt to be accountable for the actions of persons who are not fully under my control is if those persons are presented to me with all negative conditions removed. And since there is no way of insuring that children will walk into our public schools only under optimal conditions for learning, it seems I cannot morally agree to be accountable, in this narrow legal sense, for the learning of my students.
>
> So is there some means of assuring ourselves of the guarantee which the notion of accountability was originally introduced to provide -- the guarantee that children will in fact learn something specific? In view of the qualifications I have, in logic, been constrained to make, I think not.[36]

Finally, a warning from a specialist in educational measurement:

> Nothing short of random assignment of teachers as an ironclad administrative necessity will ensure that the teachers were in a fair race to produce pupil gains.[37]

The Lack of Verified Performances

Since few if any particular teaching performances can be shown to have direct relationship to specific student learning outcomes,[38] the following major questions arise in developing performance-based programs:

> What criteria shall be used for identifying and developing performances?
>
> What performances shall be taught to all prospective teachers (That is, are there generic performances)?
>
> Which performances are "specialty specific" (which shall apply to different subject areas, varying instructional purposes, and different types of learners)?

The PBTE movement appears not to have attended verv well to the resolution of these issues. Thousands of performances have been identified -- whole catalogs of them. But such compilations do not often appear to begin with local goals and objectives for schooling or to proceed to generating or adopting performances that the highest expertise and best judgment concur might provide optimum learning opportunities for accomplishing the objectives. The AACTE Committee on PBTE acknowledges this in stating:

> The Committee believes the earlier statement did not stress sufficiently that the competencies are not just picked out of the air but are derived analytically and must be related to the basic objectives of the schools.[39]

Putting it starkly, the movement has not turned its attention very much to either conducting or supporting research on two key questions: In light of goals and objectives for schooling, what performances should *all* teachers be able to demonstrate? And, what performances should particular teachers be able to demonstrate in relation to specific student learning tasks?

Once some performances are identified and agreed on, there is the complicated task of determining whether or not they can be taught, to what degree they can be taught, and by what varying methods. When appropriate methods have been identified for teaching the performances, these methods will then need to be taught to teacher educators. And one wonders who is attending to all that.

Who Should Learn What First? -- Educating the Teacher Educators

When the performances are agreed on and validated, they must be taught to prospective teachers and to teachers in service provided that knowledges, performances, and attitudes are discovered which are important for all teachers or for specific teaching tasks. And so the education and reeducation of teacher educators becomes crucial.

What performances do teacher educators need to perfect in order that their students (the prospective teachers) learn the indicated performances? Might not "what's good for the goose..." apply here? One wonders whether teacher educators have been so busy identifying performances which teachers should master that they have given little attention to what might be *even more important* in the whole process -- their own performances. One wonders who is developing performance-based programs for teacher educators with the speed and enthusiasm that performances are being developed for teachers to learn. Some teacher education institutions appear not unlike what has been said of the U.S. Congress -- anxious and willing to investigate anyone, anyplace, anytime but *itself*.

Evaluating the Mastery of Performance

In their monograph on recommendations, the AACTE Committee states, "Assessment lies at the heart of PBTE."[40] In discussing this topic, it appears that the Committee is using the term *assessment* in a broad enough sense to include *evaluation.**

We agree that *evaluation* lies at the heart of PBTE. Even when the movement has gone the long route it will take to identify, validate, and come to consensus on appropriate generic and task-specific performances (the preceding pages suggest that this activity has only just begun), it will need to arrive at some widely acceptable means for evaluating the relative mastery of various performances by prospective teachers.

The Matter of Quantification

Elam's definition of PBTE places emphasis on the specification of goals in rigorous detail and demonstration of the ability to promote desirable learning. Under such a conceptualization, the problem of how

---

*In some research contexts, the term *assessment* is used to indicate only those activities related to data gathering; making judgments from the data is termed *evaluation*.

much of a difference it takes to make a difference becomes important. That is, once a performance has been identified, isolated, described "in rigorous detail," and its essential quality for teacher education agreed on, an important question becomes, "How much of it must a teacher candidate be able to demonstrate in order to practice the profession?" Another key question will be, "With different performances, what will be the threshold of mastery by which determination can be made that *this* candidate has mastered enough of the performance to be licensed for professional practice and *that* candidate has not and should recycle?"

This is a highly complex issue. It is one that will require talent, commitment, and vast research and development resources.

What Can Be Done about Selecting Performances?

That we are pessimistic about early successes in identifying and validating performances, training for them, and quantifying and agreeing on thresholds of mastery does not mean we believe there is little or nothing that can be done to improve teaching particularly and the schools generally.

Indeed, we believe quite the opposite. Unlike Coleman and Jencks, we believe teachers *can* and *do* make a difference. And we believe schools make a difference. On this we concur with John Brademas who, in elaborating on the statement cited above, said:

> But this conclusion does not mean -- I hasten to add -- that we have to give up on the hope of being able to educate our children more effectively than we've been doing up to now.[41]

There are some postures and some efforts we can and do support in this arena.

Generally we support efforts to assist teachers, both pre- and in-service, to learn techniques that, on the basis of expertise and empirical evidences, are considered good processes *per se:* individualization, personalization, the rudiments of good group process, and activities which allow for students to pursue divergent interests and creative acts. The kind of teaching skills that are described or implied in such instruments as Indicators of Quality[42] are some of these. The approaches proposed in some of the alternative models at the University of British Columbia cited earlier also appear promising for these purposes.

In addition, we believe teachers need to learn several diverse methods for approaching the teaching of such skills as reading and mathematics. The teaching of these two skills has had extensive research and development over a considerable period. And while no single method appears to have emerged as most appropriate, several methods for each have been shown to have some reliability and validity for various purposes and with various student populations. All teacher education programs for elementary teachers should reflect in-depth understanding of and ability to manipulate and adapt several of these methodologies.

Also in social studies and science at both elementary and secondary levels, a number of programs encompass teaching strategies which are well developed and promising and should be incorporated into the preparation programs of teachers.

While every effort should be made by the schools to teach all students the basic skills and to promote their personal development in ways that will result in fuller living, "to be able to demonstrate his ability to promote desirable learning" is more than can be expected given the present state of the art and science of teaching. So the emphasis must continue to be on process rather than, as Elam puts it, on "demonstrated product or output."

The Limitation of Performance Objectives

It almost goes without saying that schools must establish some priorities. They cannot be all things to all people. And so teachers, too, must make some choices in responding to agreed-on priorities. By now, most states and many local communities have established goals for schooling. For the most part, the goals are broadly conceived and mandate the schools to concern themselves with promoting a wide spectrum of skills, knowledges, and attitudes. While there is considerable evidence that those who establish the goals (parents and other citizens with advice from professionals) are anxious that the schools do their very best to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, there is also strong evidence that they do not wish the schools to slight several other goals so commonly enumerated: citizenship, a positive self-image, healthful living, worthy home membership, and marketable work skills. Most often a minority of the goals developed, accepted, and publicly stated by the citizenry relate to basic skills.

Many of the teaching performances implemented under PBTE seem to be those that lend themselves to imparting knowledge. There appears to be little attention to teaching prospective teachers to help their students analyze, synthesize, and draw generalizations and apply them to new phenomena. Nor is much emphasis placed on the several methodologies for teaching reading and mathematics let alone on educating teachers in procedures for teaching citizenship, values clarification, healthful living, or work skills.

The emphasis on teaching teachers skills related to knowledge learnings will sooner or later result in the goals for schooling being warped to overemphasize student learning related to the knowledge areas. Nash has called attention to this:

> It seems impossible to develop a PBTE program without being able to measure the performances that are deemed desirable.

> The perennial danger is that whatever cannot be measured will simply be excluded. But according to humanistic criteria, this would leave out the most crucial educational values, given our present level of skill in measuring.[43]

Emphasis on Presentation-Type Processes

PBTE seems to over-emphasize those teaching performances based on teacher talk. The Flanders-type performances are a case in point. Most of them are based on lecturing, questioning, summarizing, synthesizing, and the like. Even the "promising" performances identified by Rosenshine and Furst draw heavily on Flanders-type performance and findings from such instruments as the Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide.

The Guide is heavily weighted to *teacher presentation* of a lesson and other teacher-centered performances. Other strategies common in a number of PBTE models are microteaching and minicourses. Both of these tend to focus attention on what the teacher does when he or she presents, asks questions, or in other ways talks *to* students. Very little emphasis seems to have been placed on student talk or active involvement of students in group activities, interpersonal skill development, individual research, or learning by doing.

The implication in heavy emphasis on such performances is that teaching consists mainly of the teacher talking. One wonders whatever happened to the sound concept of "teacher as observer and guide" which goes back 30 years or more.*

Performance Objectives as Situation Specifics

Edelfelt has called to attention "the fact that performance or behavior is not an isolated entity, that it does not exist irrespective of everything else, is of tantamount importance and is often ignored when performance criteria become a preoccupation."[44]

One's ability to demonstrate proficiency in many teaching performances depends on a broad range of *program factors* and *conditions*. Among the program factors are:

---

*This concept was reflected in the school quality measuring instrument, "The Growing Edge," published first in 1945. A more recent generation of this type of instrument, Indicators of Quality, emphasizes involving activities, including the evaluation of classroom performance by observing student behavior for the same length of time that teacher behavior is observed.

- Appropriateness and up-to-dateness of the curriculum
- Meaningfulness of the curriculum for the particular culture
- Interrelationship of program elements
- Unique characteristics of the curriculum to be taught.

On the last factor, Heath and Nielson have the following to report:

> The performance-based education model ... ignores *what* is to be taught. Though the studies reviewed here were concerned with everything from aircraft mechanics to reading, no effort is apparent in identifying the possible interactions between teacher-behavior variables and content. It seems unlikely that *one* set of teaching behaviors is most effective for teaching everything. If there is an important interaction between type of content and teaching behavior (given cognitive achievement as criteria), then the conclusion about which teaching behavior is effective may be determined as much by content as by teacher behavior.[45]

Some conditions which inevitably affect the teachers' ability to demonstrate proficient performance are:

- Decision-making power in curricular matters
- Teaching load (including but not limited to numbers of students)
- Preparation time
- Time to teach
- Opportunity for in-service development
- Availability of material and media
- Plant facilities.

Beyond these, and what may be more significant than any of them, are the characteristics of the students to be taught. It should be obvious that it will be much more difficult to demonstrate proficiency in particular performances with some student populations than with others. As noted earlier, Glass reminds us that "nothing short of random assignment of pupils to teachers as an ironclad administrative necessity will ensure that the teachers were in a fair race to produce pupil gains."[46]

If the readiness of teachers in preparation to practice the profession is to be judged in large measure by their classroom behavior, then *all* of the program factors, conditions, and differing student characteristics will need to be taken into account as variables that affect performance evaluation decisions. And because it seems possible to develop PBTE programs without measuring performance, all the above will need to be measured and their unique effects determined (placed in multiple regressions) in establishing an expectancy for teachers in preparation or in service.

In short, the performance-based movement does not seem to be paying much attention to the complex task of measuring the great array of variables cited above. In some programs general descriptions have been developed of the conditions under which particular performances are to be carried out. But we find little evidence of rigorous attempts to control key variables and to measure performance under varying program arrangements, unique classroom conditions, and with differing student populations.

We suggest some small, carefully controlled research projects for this purpose, projects in which student population characteristics are taken into account and numbers of other variables are manipulated in turn (class size, preparation time, in-service education).

Minority Group, Multicultural and Bilingual Education and PBTE

The movement has made forays into the multicultural/bilingual arenas, with implications for teacher education as it relates to minority-group needs.

McKenna and Sandoval have stated:

> It appears to us that much of what teachers must learn in order to function effectively in multicultural education lies in the affective domain and is highly value laden....[47]

And Pettigrew[48] has called attention to the importance of teacher behaviors which demonstrate that their attitudes toward expectancies of culturally different children are positive and constructive.

These positions are strengthened in the pronouncements of Rogers, who states:

> The predominant characteristic of teacher preparation programs attempting to train teachers to work with minority group students was its basic focus on influencing the attitude and value structure of prospective teachers....
>
> Since affective factors appear to be critical to the effective teaching of minority students, the emphasis ... in PBTE does not appear to offer a reasonable alternative to present teacher-education programs.[49]

As a result of exploration and the review of the work of such authorities as those cited, McKenna and Sandoval concluded:

> ... we do not find evidence that the PBTE movement as presently conceived has much concerned itself with this kind of teacher education in the generic sense, let alone for multicultural purposes.[50]

Financial and Other Resources

If teacher education is to be changed meaningfully and effectively it will cost money--large sums of money--no matter what the model.

Assume for the moment that one were to opt only for the following: (1) rigorous instruction in current relevant substantive disciplines already cited, and (2) a minimum internship of one year (two would be better) with adequate supervisory and support service from both university and school system. This alone would increase the per-student cost of teacher education severalfold by adding at least one year to university pursuits and a minimum of three or four times as much to the field experience. Then if a skills laboratory based on presently available and at least partially developed performances were to be included, additional costs would be required.

Above and beyond this, if a large research effort were to be mounted to identify a broad range of performances believed to best reflect the goals and objectives of schools, if laboratory instruction in the performances were tested and validated, if the performances were tested in the schools and finally related to student learning outcomes, the cost might outrun that of the total NASA effort which ended with five trips to the moon. Whatever the costs, the human resources in terms of talent and time would be immense. And the time-line alone might be twice that of the moonshot operation, or at least 20 years.

Or consider the need for released time for teachers to become involved in teacher education. Paying for adequate time would be costly. An almost universal complaint of those involved in PBTE programs is lack of time and money.

Recent estimates are that the total effort per year over the last four or five years in the form of financial support to PBTE from the USOE has been $3.5 million.* Much of this has gone to run conferences and publish literature. Darland has said "there is no lack of literature about PBTE.... We even have a growing set of literature about the literature."[51] What might be judged as truly rigorous research and development efforts have been miniscule.

It seems reasonable to conclude that if either PBTE or alternatives are to be looked on with optimism, there will need to be infinitely more resources applied. And the priorities in allocation of resources will need to be redirected.

---

*Additional funds have been allocated from postsecondary education programs and the National Institute of Education but figures on these were unavailable.

Relating PBTE to Accountability and Licensure

No matter what is said or how many disclaimers are set down, the movement in its origins and present activities strongly implies as a purpose accountability and licensure of personnel already in service on the basis of performance. PBTE conferences have dealt with such topics as PBTE and teacher evaluation and PBTE and certification.

Strong proponents of PBTE have acknowledged its origins in and relation to the accountability movement.[52] And it has been formally cited as a reflection of the accountability movement:

> Performance-based teacher education is the most visible manifestation at the university level of the accountability pressures in the educational system that came to full flower in the late 1960's.[53]

On the accountability issue, Cortright and Pershing have well summarized the way teachers look on the movement:

> Opposition to or serious criticism of PBTE by teachers does not mean that teachers do not want to be accountable. Rather, their position suggests that they merely question the validity of PBTE as *the* way of teacher preparation. Teachers feel threatened if PBTE implies teacher incompetence and a necessity that teachers must demonstrate competency when such has not been clearly defined.[54]

And Brademas has suggested a way of looking at the flow of accountability:

> ... the assumption is that it is perfectly proper for there to be a heirarchy of accountability, with persons at the lower levels being accountable to persons at next higher levels. But I want to suggest to you that this is not a democratic way of doing things. If we want to say that teachers are accountable-to-someone, it seems only fair to have someone accountable-to-teachers.[55]

Accountability in our judgment must not mandate levels of proficiency on specific performances as long as there continues to be little agreement on the performances, extreme difficulty in measuring proficiency levels, and lack of verification of either in relation to student learning.

Finally, our definition of accountability runs as follows:

> Accountability consists of describing clearly what one intends to do and reporting honestly how well the intentions have been realized.

State certification officers take strong interest in the PBTE movement, including participating in its work sessions and writing papers in its defense. One of the most recent monographs deals with PBTE and accreditation; and even though the manuscript does not seem to make much of a case for linking the two, its very existence bears witness that the idea is afoot.[56]

On the licensure side, it hardly seems necessary to make the point because the lack of verification of performance has been so fully dealt with at earlier places in this monograph. And it might be assumed that no thinking educators and enlightened lay policymakers would propose changes so basic and pervading as revised licensure procedures except on the basis of sound and verified evidence that the new procedures will serve the profession and the public better than the old. Since some states, however, have prematurely made attempts at mandating PBTE as the only form of teacher education (which at least implies licensure on a single basis)--New York and Texas are cases in point--strong exception needs to be taken to such plans lest some states become locked into revised licensure procedures decades ahead of their verification.

Who's Evaluating PBTE?

Since PBTE proposes to so rigorously hold its products accountable for conducting specific performances, one would expect proponents of the movement to be anxious and willing to develop extensive and intensive means for evaluating the performances of PBTE's own contributions to improving teacher education. One might expect to see myriad evaluation models employing multiple indexes. One would look for numbers of experimental groups matched with control groups undergoing conventional programs. And one would assume extensive evaluation by the students experiencing the programs, by teachers and administrators in the schools where the experiments are operational, by individual independent researchers and research teams, and by numerous outside impartial expert panels.

One would think that a movement so bent on precisely evaluating the performance of its products could hardly avoid, let alone neglect, such scrutiny. But all this seems to have gone sadly unheeded. In their haste to get something going (a number of PBTE proponents have pronounced that implementation cannot await research and evaluation), many in the movement have neglected to build in rigorous evaluation systems from the beginning.

So several years of operation in most programs are not likely to provide much indication of their successes compared to conventional programs. It appears that the profession and the public will just have to take their word for it or dismiss the whole thing as another educational panacea that wasn't very well conceived.

Section V

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TEACHERS AND OTHER EDUCATORS

The in-service education needs of teachers are great in terms of sheer numbers. Over two million teachers served in the schools of the country in 1974-75, two million teachers working daily with 25 or 30 or more elementary students or 125 or more secondary students, working with students who come to school with increasingly wider ranges of verbal skills, aptitudes, motivations, and values. These widening differences in student characteristics alone create problems that the most seasoned teachers find themselves frequently unable to respond to. In addition, communities require that ever-increasing responsibilities be taken on by teachers in service--teaching about the ecology, drug abuse, consumer education, sex education, computer programming--a never-ending list. Time for teachers to attend to all these responsibilities diminishes. Staggered lunch periods, alternating bus schedules, increased reporting requirements, security precautions, and many other conditions contribute to the shrinking time to teach. Recent estimates have it that the average amount of time a teacher has during the school day to work with individuals or small groups is about two minutes.[57] And all these things and others change so fast that teachers in service require massive opportunities to learn new and better ways of coping.

A recent NEA assessment of teachers' professional needs placed these kinds of issues near the top.

1. To learn how better to diagnose student individual learning difficulties

2. To learn how to deal with apathetic students

3. To learn how better to work with students with wide ranges of achievement levels.

These are only a few of the many complex and perplexing problems facing teachers in service. When one thinks on the extent and complexity of the problems, on the vast numbers involved--2 million-plus teachers and 45 million students, is it any wonder some suggest that pre-service education of teachers be given very low priority? Is it any wonder some suggest that all efforts and resources in teacher education, no matter what the model, be placed on in-service?

Rather than beginning with systems borrowed from business and industry and with accountability models out of the military, might not the performance-based movement better have begun with problems of high incidence reported by teachers as they interrelate daily with their students? What better use might be made of the talent, funds, and energies going to PBTE than to join with teachers to research and develop better means for them to diagnose and prescribe for individual learning difficulties? Place such an effort beside some of the following competencies found in the catalogs that have come out of the PBTE movement:

- Demonstrates readiness for teaching by being present at teaching station before students appear
- Constructs worksheets for teaching reading comprehension
- Administers corporal punishment properly
- Considers the location of electrical outlets in the classroom
- Collects catalogs of science equipment and materials
- Modifies behavior as needed
- Includes copies of written progress reports in students' cumulative records.

Teacher Education as a Continuum

If, as we believe it ought to be, the education of a professional is to be looked on as a career-long continuum, the initial conceptualization, the construction of models, and the implementation of PBTE programs should include the gradual development from novice to full professional with substantial provision for the more than two million teachers in service. On this matter, such questions as the following appear to be pertinent but not much attended to by the PBTE movement:

- What generic performances are so essential that all teachers in service should be helped to learn them immediately?
- What speciality-specific performances are so essential that all in-service teachers in particular specialities should learn them immediately?
- How can teachers in service be assured of the essential qualities of these performances?
- How will opportunities be provided for teachers in service to learn the essential performances?
- How will new performance needs of teachers in service be identified on a continuing career-long basis?
- How will continuous opportunities to learn newly validated performances be provided for in-service teachers throughout their career?
- How will internship experiences be organized so that interns will gradually assume responsibilities as full professionals?
- What provisions will be made for lightened teaching loads for

those who work full-time in the schools but are being gradually inducted to full professionalism?

All these seem important issues to be dealt with as the massive task of attending to in-service teachers' performance needs is considered.

Needs Assessment as a Source of Performance Identification for Teachers

It has already been suggested that a major data source for determining teachers' in-service education needs is through needs assessments of teachers themselves.*

Since few if any of the lists of performances that have come out of the PBTE movement have had much validation, why not ask teachers themselves what they need to learn most or to be able to do in order to improve their instructional practice? And since the low validity of most of the performance lists appears to be inherent and promises to be so for a long duration (unless there occurs some unlikely and monumental research breakthrough), teacher needs assessment for determining what teachers should learn and be able to do seems logical and practical.

Procedures for such needs assessments are already available. And indeed, hundreds of local teachers' associations all across the country have achieved a large measure of success in identifying teacher in-service needs. This has been brought about by the NEA through its needs assessment project, now in the third year of operation.

Those who propose changes in teacher education, both pre-service and in-service, would do well to take long serious looks at what teachers report as their most urgent professional needs. What practicing teachers must contend with today, pre-service teachers will face tomorrow. As much as it might be wished otherwise, things do not change that fast.

Responding to the Needs

When essential knowledges and performances have been identified by in-service teachers themselves, college and university personnel should then join with teachers and other school district personnel in determining the most viable means for attaining the required know-how.

One promising approach seems to be the teacher-center concept. Over the past several years, the National Education Association has been working with its state and local affiliates to explore and test teacher-centered approaches to in-service education. As defined by the NEA, the concept encompasses the following:

---

*Current catalogs and other lists of performances seem rather to have come mainly from professors, researchers, administrators, and curriculum specialists.

> An assembling of and/or a place where...teachers learn more about teaching. It implies a planning, program, and administrative process in which teachers have more than simply the right to participate in a continuing education program, once a program has been established. A teachers' center implies proprietary planning rights.[58]

As reflected in the British implementation of the concept, the NEA definition is explicit in requiring that "teacher-centering" be an enterprise in which teachers learn what *they* sense they need to learn most, under conditions *they* find most conducive to that learning, and from those *they* believe most able to teach it to them in ways that will relate it meaningfully and directly to their daily professional responsibilities.

In-service Education and the Field-Based Concept

With its heavy conceptual emphasis on field-basedness, one might expect that it would be natural for PBTE to relate directly to in-service education. But this seems not to be the case, even though some PBTE literature and at least one conference have been devoted to aspects of in-service as they relate to the movement. Performances seem to continue to be generated mainly at the college and university level, taught first to prospective teachers in seminars or laboratories on the college campus and then tried out by them (as student teachers) in the school setting.

An action research effort involving teachers, interns, and college-university personnel for generating and validating performances might be well worth trying. Teachers in service have much to contribute on what works or what is likely to work. If the school were to become a true laboratory setting in which teachers, professors, and interns worked closely and intensively together with students as they devise and test new teaching performances, there might soon be workable solutions to some of the unsolved teaching and learning problems that plague today's schools. This is an idea that has been about a long time. Schaefer suggested it nearly a decade ago.[59]

SOME SUMMARIZING CONCLUSIONS

1. A broad range of issues related to innovating programs for teacher education are appropriate to be considered for negotiation by teachers.

2. Governance of teacher education by consortium will need to involve teachers as decision makers in proportions that reflect their ratio to numbers in the total profession.

3. Teachers have a broad and serious professional stake in teacher education as evidenced by their past and continued commitment to and involvement in improving and stabilizing the profession and in working toward responsible professional governance.

4. There is no valid research base for evaluating teacher performances on the basis of student learning outcomes.

5. A wide variety of carefully controlled research programs are needed to identify and validate teaching performances which are most likely to produce student learning.

6. Performances proposed for test and tryout need to be relevant to school goals and objectives.

7. School of education personnel will need to develop and validate performances for themselves that will result in their students learning the performances agreed on.

8. Precautions need to be taken that not only measurable performances are considered but also a broad range of empirically generated affective processes that in and of themselves make sense, no matter what the outcomes.

9. Teaching objectives need to be implemented through a broad range of performances that will make it possible for teachers to attend to the generally broad goals established for schooling, performances which encompass, in addition to skills learnings, a wide range of affective behaviors and attitudes.

10. Proposed changes in teacher education need to take into account that teaching proficiency is situation-specific. That is, performance does not exist apart from the total setting in which it takes place. The ability to demonstrate proficiency in many performances will depend in large measure on a broad range of program factors and conditions.

11. Teacher education for multicultural purposes needs generally to emphasize the affective domain and specifically to concern itself with attitudes toward and expectencies of culturally different students.

12. If teacher education is to be changed meaningfully and effectively, it will take large sums of money, sums that many times surpass what is

now being allocated to the enterprise.

13. To effectively restructure teacher education will require time lines much longer than any now proposed.

14. Accountability and licensing considerations based on changes in teacher education must await verification of the usefulness of the new procedures on the basis of test and tryout over long enough periods of time to assure they are superior to traditional procedures.

15. The field-based aspects of teacher education should involve teachers in service in such a way that needs of interns are based in large measure on problems identified by those teachers already practicing the profession.

16. Already existing, well-developed assessment procedures for identifying in-service needs of teachers represents one appropriate mechanism for identifying teaching performance to be developed, tested, and tried out.

17. A promising approach for improving teacher education is for teachers in service, professors, and interns to work together on developing, testing, and trying new performances as solutions to those unsolved teaching and learning problems identified by assessment of the professional needs of teachers in service.

Footnotes

[1] AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations, PBTE Series #16 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, February 1974).

[2] Phyllis D. Hamilton, Competency-Based Teacher Education, Research Memorandum EPRC 2158-19 (Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1973).

[3] National Education Association, Organizational Aspects of In-Service Education (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1974).

[4] In a letter to the author.

[5] In a letter to the author.

[6] Michael Kirst, Issues in Governance for Performance-Based Teacher Education, PBTE Series #13 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973), p. 19.

[7] Ibid., p. 20.

[8] Theodore Andrews, The Manchester Interview, PBTE Series #3 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972), p. 5.

[9] Roy Edelfelt, Ronald Corwin, and Elizabeth Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1974), p. 62.

[10] Dar A. Griffiths, "Intellectualism and Professionalism," Education Quarterly 5 (Fall 1973): 4-5.

[11] Ibid., p. 1.

[12] Margaret Lindsey, "Performance-Based Teacher Education: Examinations of a Slogan," Journal of Teacher Education 24 (Fall 1973): 183.

[13] National Education Association, Task Force and Other Reports (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1973), pp. 2-13.

[14] From an unpublished narrative by Constance Plunkett, classroom teacher and chairperson of the Vermont Education Association's Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission.

[15] "The Committee Structure of the National Commission on Performance-Based Education" (Unpublished paper, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974) p. 1.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Culture of Efficiency (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[18] Allen Schick, "A Death in the Bureaucracy: The Demise of Federal PPB," Public Administration Review. 33 (March/April 1973): 146-56.

[19] Harold Enarson, "The Cost Analysis Trap," New York Times, January 15, 1975.

[20] AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations, PBTE Series #16 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), Appendix B-3, p. 38.

[21] Ibid., p. 10.

[22] Richard H. Hersh, "Preventing a Second Orthodoxy: A Formative Evaluation of a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program" (Unpublished Paper, University of Toledo, 1974).

[23] Fred T. Wilhelms, Realignments for Teacher Education, Eleventh Charles W. Hunt Lecture (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970).

[24] Harry S. Broudy, A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education, PBTE Series, #4 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972).

[25] Arthur W. Coombs and Suzanne M. Kinzer, "The University of Florida's Childhood Education Program: An Alternative Approach to CBTE," in W. Robert Houston, ed., Exploring Competency-Based Teacher Education (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974), p. 183.

[26] Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil, Models of Teaching (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.), 1972.

[27] Marsha Weil, "Deriving Teaching Skills from Models of Teaching," in W. Robert Houston, ed., Exploring Competency-Based Teacher Education op. cit., p. 116.

[28] Bruce R. Joyce, Jonas F. Soltis, and Marsha Weil, Performance-Based Teacher Education Design Alternatives: The Concept of Unity, PBTE Series #14 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, September 1974), pp. 7-9.

[29] Barak Rosenshine and Norma Furst, "Research in Teacher Performance Criteria," in B. Othanel Smith, ed., Research in Teacher Education: A Symposium (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).

[30] Robert W. Heath and Mark A. Nielson, "The Research Base for Performance-Based Teacher Education," Review of Educational Research 44 (Fall): 463-84.

[31] David A. Potter, "Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement," PBTE (Multi-State Consortium on PBTE) 2 (March 1974): 1-5.

[32] Weil, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

[33] Stanley Elam, *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?* PBTE Series #1 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971), p. 1.

[34] Dave Darland, "Some Complexities of Accountability," *Today's Education* 64 (Jan. - Feb.): 21.

[35] Robert E. Stake, "School Accountability Laws," *Journal of Educational Evaluation* 4 (February 1973): 2.

[36] John Brademas, "Accountability: A Rationale," *Commentary* (Cooperative Accountability Project) 1 (March 1974): 5.

[37] Gene V. Glass, "Statistical and Measurement Problems in Implementing the Stull Act," in N. L. Gage, ed., *Mandated Evaluation of Educators: A Conference on California's Stull Act* (Washington, D.C.: Education Resources Division, Capital Publications, 1973), p. 54.

[38] Barak Rosenshine, *Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement*, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement Studies, No. 1. (London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971).

[39] AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, *Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations.* PBTE Series: #16 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974), p. 33.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[41] Brademas, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

[42] William S. Vincent, *Indicators of Quality*, (New York: Institute of Administrative Research, 1968).

[43] Paul Nash, *A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education*, PBTE Series #10 (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973), p. 13.

[44] Roy A. Edelfelt, "A Conception of Performance-Based Teacher Education" (Unpublished paper, NEA, 1973), p. 2.

[45] Robert W. Heath and Mark A. Nielson, "The Research Base for Performance-Based Teacher Education," *Review of Educational Research* 44 (Fall 1974): 476.

[46] Glass, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

[47] Bernard McKenna and Carmel Sandoval, "The Application of Performance-Based Teacher Education in Multi-Cultural Education: A Teachers Association Point of View," in Carl A. Grant, ed., *Sifting and Winnowing: An Exploration of the Relationship between Multi-Cultural Education and CBTE* (Madison, Wisconsin: Teacher Corps Associates, University of Wisconsin, 1975), p. 188.

[48] L. Eudora Pettigrew, "Competency-Based Teacher Education: Teacher Training for Multicultural Education," in William A. Hunter, ed., *Multicultural Education Through Competency-Based Teacher Education* (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974).

[49] Frederick A. Rogers, "Minority Groups and PBTE," in Ralph A. Smith, ed., *Regaining Educational Leadership: Critical Essays in PBTE/CBTE, Behavioral Objectives, and Accountability* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975), pp. 178, 182.

[50] McKenna and Sandoval, *op*. *cit*., p. 189.

[51] David D. Darland, "Is the Fad in the Fire?" (Unpublished paper, NEA, 1973).

[52] J. S. Sandefur, in a speech before a workshop on PBTE, San Antonio, Texas, January 6, 1975.

[53] J. Myron Atkins, "Professional Leadership and PBTE," in Ralph A. Smith, ed., *Regaining Educational Leadership*, *op*. *cit*., p. 15.

[54] Richard Cortright and Gerry Pershing, "Performance-Based Teacher Education and Certification: Can Teachers Buy It?" (Unpublished paper, NEA, 1973).

[55] Brademas, *op*. *cit*., p. 3.

[56] Rolf W. Larson, *Accreditation Problems and the Promise of PBTE* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974).

[57] Eaton H. Conant, "What Do Teachers Do All Day?" *Saturday Review/World*, 1 (June 1, 1974): 55.

[58] National Education Association, "Teachers Centered Professional Development" (Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1973).

[59] Robert J. Schaefer, *The School as a Center of Inquiry* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967).

Bibliography

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education. *Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations.* PBTE Series # 16. Washington, D.C.: The Association, February 1974.

Andrews, Theodore. *The Manchester Interview.* PBTE Series #3. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April 1972.

Brademas, John. "Accountability: A Rationale." *Commentary* 1 (March 1974): 5-6. (Denver: Cooperative Accountability Project, Colorado Department of Education.)

Broudy, Harry S. *A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education.* PBTE Series #4. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, May 1972.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Conant, Eaton H. "What Do Teachers Do All Day?" *Saturday Review/World* 1 (June 1, 1974): 55.

Cortright, Richard, and Pershing, Gerry. "Performance-Based Teacher Education and Certification: Can Teachers Buy It?" Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1973. (Unpublished)

Darland, Dave. "Is the Fad in the Fire?" Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973. (Unpublished)

__________. "Some Complexities of Accountability." *Today's Education* 64 (January - February 1975): 21.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "A Conception of Performance-Based Teacher Education." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973. (Unpublished)

Edelfelt, Roy A.; Corwin, Ronald; and Hanna, Elizabeth. *Lessons from the Teacher Corps.* Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1974.

Educational Testing Service. "The Committee Structure of the National Commission on Performance-Based Education." Princeton, N. J.: The Educational Testing Service, 1974. (Unpublished)

Elam, Stanley. *Performance-Based Teacher Education: What is the State of the Art?* PBTE Series #1. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, December 1971.

Enarson, Harold. "The Cost Analysis Trap," *New York Times*, January 15, 1975.

Glass, Gene V. "Statistical and Measurement Problems in Implementing the Stull Act." In Gage, N. L., ed. *Mandated Evaluation of Educators: A Conference on California's Stull Act*. Washington, D.C.: Education Resources Division, Capitol Publications, 1973.

Griffiths, Dan A. "Intellectualism and Professionalism." *Education Quarterly* 5 (Fall 1973): 4-5.

Hamilton, Phyllis D. *Competency-Based Teacher Education*. Research Memorandum EPRC 2158-19. Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1973.

Heath, Robert W., and Nielson, Mark A. "The Research Basis for Performance-Based Teacher Education." *Review of Educational Research* 44: (Fall 1974): 463-84.

Hersh, Richard H. "Preventing a Second Orthodoxy: A Formative Evaluation of a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program." Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, 1974. (Unpublished)

Houston, W. Robert, ed. *Exploring Competency-Based Teacher Education*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

Joyce, Bruce R., and Weil, Marsha. *Models of Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Joyce, Bruce R.; Soltis, Jonas F.; and Weil, Marsha. *Performance-Based Teacher Education Design Alternatives: The Concept of Unity*. PBTE Series #14. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, September 1974.

Kirst, Michael. *Issues in Governance for Performance-Based Teacher Education*. PBTE Series #13. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, October 1973.

Larson, Rolf. *Accreditation Problems and the Promise of PBTE*. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, November 1974.

Lindsey, Margaret. "Performance-Based Teacher Education: Examination of a Slogan." *Journal of Teacher Education* 24 (Fall 1973): 180-86).

McKenna, Bernard, and Sandoval, Carmel. "The Application of Performance-Based Teacher Education to Multi-Cultural Education: A Teachers Association Point of View." In Grant, Carl A., ed. *Sifting and Winnowing: An Exploration of the Relationship between Multi-Cultural Education and CBTE*. Madison, Wisconsin: Teacher Corps Associates, University of Wisconsin, 1975.

Nash, Paul. *A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education*. PBTE Series #10. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April 1973.

National Education Association. "Organizational Aspects of In-Service Education." Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1974.

______________________________. "Teacher-Centered Professional Development." Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1973. 4 pp.

______________________________. "Report of the Task Force on Practitioner Involvement in Teacher Education." Task Force and Other Reports. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1973. pp. 2-13.

Pettigrew, L. Eudora. "Competency-Based Teacher Education: Teacher Training for Multi-Cultural Education." In Hunter, William A., ed. Multi-Cultural Education through Competency-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Potter, David A. "Teacher Behaviors and Student Achievement." PBTE 2 (March 1974): 1-4. Albany: Multi-State Consortium on PBTE, New York State Education Department.

Rosenshine, Barak. Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement Studies, No. 1. London: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971.

Rosenshine, Barak, and Furst, Norma. "Research in Teacher Performance Criteria." In Smith, B. Othanel, ed. Research in Teacher Education: A Symposium. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Schaefer, Robert J. The School as a Center of Inquiry. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Schick, Allen. "A Death in the Bureaucracy: The Demise of Federal PPB." Public Administration Review 33 (March/April): 146-56.

Smith, Ralph A., ed. Regaining Educational Leadership: Critical Essays in PBTE/CBTE, Behavioral Objectives, and Accountability. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Stake, Robert E. "School Accountability Laws." Journal of Educational Evaluation 4 (February 1973): 2.

Vincent, William S. Indicators of Quality. New York: Institute of Administrative Research, 1968.

Wilhelms, Fred. Realignments for Teacher Education. Eleventh Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

ABOUT AACTE

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is an organization of more than 860 colleges and universities joined together in a common interest: more effective ways of preparing educational personnel for our changing society. It is national in scope, institutional in structure, and voluntary. It has served teacher education for 55 years in professional tasks which no single institution, agency, organization, or enterprise can accomplish alone.

AACTE's members are located in every state of the nation and in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Collectively, they prepare more than 90 percent of the teaching force that enters American schools each year.

The Association maintains its headquarters in the National Center for Higher Education, in Washington, D.C. -- the nation's capital, which also in recent years has become an educational capital. This location enables AACTE to work closely with many professional organizations and government agencies concerned with teachers and their preparation.

In AACTE headquarters, a stable professional staff is in continuous interaction with other educators and with officials who influence education, both in immediate actions and future thrusts. Educators have come to rely upon the AACTE headquarters office for information, ideas, and other assistance and, in turn, to share their aspirations and needs. Such interaction alerts the staff and officers to current and emerging needs of society and of education and makes AACTE *the* center for teacher education. The professional staff is regularly out in the field--nationally and internationally--serving educators and keeping abreast of the "real world." The headquarters office staff implements the Association's objectives and programs, keeping them vital and valid.

Through conferences, study committees, commissions, task forces, publications, and projects, AACTE conducts a program relevant to the current needs of those concerned with better preparation programs for educational personnel. Major programmatic thrusts are carried out by commissions on international education, multicultural education, and accreditation standards. Other activities include government relations and a consultative service in teacher education.

A number of activities are carried on collaboratively. These include major fiscal support for and selection of higher education representatives on the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education--an activity sanctioned by the National Commission on Accrediting and a joint enterprise of higher education institutions represented by AACTE, organizations of school board members, classroom teachers, state certification officers, and chief state school officers. The Association headquarters provides secretariat services for two organizations which help make teacher education more interdisciplinary and comprehensive: the Associated Organizations of Teacher Education and the International Council on Education for Teaching. A major interest in teacher education provides a common bond between AACTE and fraternal organizations.

AACTE is deeply concerned with and involved in the major education issues of the day. Combining the considerable resources inherent in the consortium--constituted through a national voluntary association--with strengths of others creates a synergism of exceptional productivity and potentiality. Serving as the nerve center and spokesman for major efforts to improve education personnel, the Association brings to its task credibility, built-in cooperation and communications, contributions in cash and kind, and diverse staff and membership capabilities.

AACTE provides a capability for energetically, imaginatively, and effectively moving the nation forward through better prepared educational personnel. From its administration of the pioneering educational television program, "Continental Classroom," to its involvement of 20,000 practitioners, researchers, and decision makers in developing the current *Recommended Standards for Teacher Education*, to many other activities, AACTE has demonstrated its organizational and consortium qualifications and experiences in conceptualizing, studying and experimenting, communicating, and implementing diverse thrusts for carrying out socially and educationally significant activities. With the past as prologue, AACTE is proud of its history and confident of its future among the "movers and doers" seeking continuous renewal of national aspirations and accomplishments through education.

ABOUT THE TEXAS TEACHER CENTER PROJECT

The AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education serves as the national component of the Texas Teacher Center Project. This Project was initiated in July, 1970, through a grant to the Texas Education Agency from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, USOE. The Project was initially funded under the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program and the national component was subcontracted by the Texas Education Agency to AACTE.

One of the original thrusts of the Texas Teacher Center Project was to conceptualize and field test performance-based teacher education programs in pilot situations and contribute to a statewide effort to move teacher certification to a performance base. By the inclusion of the national component in the Project, the Texas Project made it possible for all efforts in the nation related to performance-based teacher education to gain national visibility. More important, it gave to the nation a central forum where continuous study and further clarification of the performance-based movement might take place.

While the Texas Teacher Center Project is of particular interest to AACTE's Performance-Based Teacher Education Committee, the services of the Committee are available, within its resources, to all states, colleges and universities, and groups concerned with the improvement of preparation programs for school personnel.

AACTE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Executive Committee:

John Dunworth, President and Chairman of the Board, AACTE; President, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Sam P. Wiggins; Immediate Past President, AACTE; Dean, College of Education, The Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Frederick R. Cyphert, President-elect, AACTE; Dean, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dean C. Corrigan, Dean, College of Education and Social Services, The University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont 05401

Bert L. Sharp, Dean, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601

Ex Officio Member: *Edward C. Pomeroy*, Executive Director, AACTE, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

Sister Maria Petra Dempsey, Chairwoman, Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, Louisiana 70125

Daniel E. Griffiths, Dean, School of Education, New York University, New York, New York 10003

C. Glen Hass, Professor of Education, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611

Robert Heideman, Director of Educational Placement, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Henry J. Hermanowicz, Dean, College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Asa G. Hilliard, Dean, School of Education, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California 94132

James Kelly, Jr., Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Loretta R. Konecki, Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Regis College, Denver, Colorado 80221

Paul B. Mohr, Sr., Dean, College of Education, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Tallahassee, Florida 32307

Curtis E. Nash, Dean, School of Education, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan 48859

J. T. Sandefur, Dean, College of Education, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Betty B. Schantz, Assistant Dean, University-School Relations, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

Bob G. Woods, Dean, College of Education, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri 65201

Liaison Members:

Dave Darland, Associate Director, Instruction and Professional Development, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Rolf W. Larson, Director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006

AACTE ORDER FORM FOR OTHER RECENT AACTE PUBLICATIONS

Number of Copies

YEARBOOKS - Annual Meeting Sessions

______ *Strengthening the Education of Teachers* 1975 (available after June 1975)

______ *Ferment and Momentum in Teacher Education* 1974 105 pages $4.00

POSITION PAPERS

______ *Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene* - Allen Schmieder, Sam J. Yarger, 1974, 50 pages $3.00

______ *Accreditation Problems & the Promise of PBTE* - Rolf W. Larson, 1974, 29 pages $3.00

TEACHER EDUCATION CONCEPTUAL MODELS

______ *Obligation for Reform* George Denemark, Joost Yff, 1974, 68 pages $2.00

Number of Copies

THE CHARLES W. HUNT LECTURES

______ *Strengthening the Education of Teachers* - C. E. Gross 1975 $1.50

______ *Ferment and Momentum in Teacher Education* - Margaret Lindsey 1974, 23 pages $1.00

Journal of Teacher Education (Quarterly)

______ One-year subscription - $10.00
______ Three-year subscription - $25.00
______ Back issues available - $ 3.00 ea.
(Specify date)________________

INTERNATIONAL-MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

______ *Multicultural Education through Competency-Based Teacher Education* William A. Hunter, Editor, 1974, 288 pages $6.00

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders. A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchases of five or more publications of any one title.

Payment enclosed__________ Amount______________________________

Purchase Order Number______________________________

NAME____
(Please print or type)

ADDRESS____

____ZIP CODE____________

Ask for our complete list of AACTE publications on teacher education.

Send orders to: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for
Teacher Education, Suite #610, One Dupont Circle,
Washington, D.C. 20036

AACTE SPECIAL SERIES ON PBTE

Number of Copies	PBTE Monograph Series	
________	#1	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: What Is the State of the Art?" by Stanley Elam @ $2.00
________	#2	"The Individualized, Competency-Based System of Teacher Education at Weber State College" by Caseel Burke @ $2.00
________	#3	"Manchester Interview: Competency-Based Teacher Education/Certification" by Theodore Andrews @ $2.00
________	#4	"A Critique of PBTE" by Harry S. Broudy @ $2.00
________	#5	"Competency-Based Teacher Education: A Scenario" by James Cooper and Wilford Weber @ $2.00
________	#6	"Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University" by Frederic T. Giles and Clifford Foster @ $3.00
________	#7	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography" by AACTE and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education @ $3.00
________	#8	"Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs: A Comparative Description" by Iris Elfenbein @ $3.00
________	#9	"Competency-Based Education: The State of the Scene" by Allen A. Schmieder (jointly with ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education) @ $3.00
________	#10	"A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Paul Nash @ $2.00
________	#11	"Performance-Based Teacher Education and the Subject Matter Fields" by Michael F. Shugrue @ $2.00
________	#12	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: Some Measurement and Decision-Making Considerations" by Jack C. Merwin @ $2.00
________	#13	"Issues in Governance for Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Michael W. Kirst @ $2.00
________	#14	"Performance-Based Teacher Education Design Alternatives: The Concept of Unity" by Bruce R. Joyce, Jonas F. Soltis, and Marsha Weil @ $3.00
________	#15	"A Practical Management System for Performance-Based Teacher Education" by Castelle Gentry and Charles Johnson @ $3.00
________	#16	"Achieving the Potential of Performance-Based Teacher Education: Recommendations" by the AACTE Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education @ $3.00
________	#17	"Assessment and Research in Teacher Education: Focus on PBTE" by Donald M. Medley, Ruth and Robert Soar @ $3.00
________	#18	"PBTE: Viewpoints of Two Teacher Education Organizations" by Eugenia Kemble and Bernard H. McKenna @ $4.00
________	#19	"Performance-Based Teacher Education: A 1975 Commentary" (minimum order 5 copies for $3.50)

	Technical Assistance Paper Series	
________	#1	"What Competencies Should Be Included in a C/PBTE Program?" by Patricia Kay @ $2.50

BILLED ORDERS: Billed orders will be accepted only when made on official purchase orders of institutions, agencies, or organizations. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Payment must accompany all other orders. There are no minimum orders.

DISCOUNTS: A 10 percent discount is allowed on purchase of five or more publications of any one title. A 10 percent discount is allowed on all orders by wholesale agencies.

Payment enclosed________________________ Amount_________________________

Purchase Order No.________________________

NAME____

ADDRESS____ ZIP CODE__________________

Please address: Order Department, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Suite #610,
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

PBTE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

The Committee Membership plus the following persons comprise the Advisory Council

Elbert Brooks, Superintendent of Schools, Metropolitan Schools, 2601 Bransford Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee 37203

George Denemark, Dean, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506

George Dickson, Dean, College of Education, University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606

William Jenkins, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Florida International University, Tamiami Trail, Miami, Florida 33174

J.W. Maucker, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Office, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas 66801

Donald McCarty, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Michael Shugrue, Dean, Community Relations and Academic Development, Richmond College, City University of New York, 130 Stuyvesant Place, Staten Island, New York 10301

John Skinner, President, Student NEA, 1201 16th Street, Room 501, Washington, D.C. 20036

Atilano Valencia, Chairman, Department of Education, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, New Mexico 87701

LIAISON MEMBERS:

Theodore Andrews, Associate in Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York 12201 *Multi-State Consortium*

James Collins, Assistant Dean, College of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210 *National Consortium of CBE Centers*

Norman Johnson, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707 *Southern Consortium*

Donald Orlosky, Professor of Education and Director of LTI, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620 *Leadership Training Institute for Educational Personnel Development*

Allen Schmieder, Chief, Support Programs, Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202 *Division of Educational Systems Development*

Emmitt Smith, Research Professor, West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas 79075 *Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems Project*

Frank Sobol, Deputy Director for Programs in Teaching and Curriculum, Office of Research, National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20208 *National Institute of Education*

James Steffensen, Acting Chief, Program Development Branch, Teacher Corps, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202 *Teacher Corps*